

666.

42781/B

N. IV. 8
19

JOHN · A ·
COCKBURN



HIS BOOK

✓

THE NAME AND NUMBER
OF THE BEAST.

THE NAME AND NUMBER
OF THE BRIST

L. AND J. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ ; LATEINOS ;

OR, THE

ONLY PROPER AND APPELLATIVE NAME OF THE

MAN,

WHOSE PROPHETICAL NUMBER IN GREEK NUMERALS, IS,

χξς', or 666 ; Rev. xiii. 18 ;

DEMONSTRATED TO BE

THE ECCLESIASTICAL MARK OR NAME OF THE BEAST,

WHO HAD

"TWO HORNS LIKE A LAMB, AND HE SPAKE AS A DRAGON ;"

Rev. xiii. 11—18 ;

BEING NONE OTHER THAN

THE POPE OF ROME :

Whose CHURCH, and KINGDOM are, even NOW, INTRINSICALLY, and

APPELLATIVELY,

L A T I N .

"LATEINOS NOMEN HABET SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX NUMERUM : et VALDE VERISIMILE est, quoniam NOVISSIMUM REGNUM HOC HABET VOCABULUM. LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC REGNANT." IRENÆ. Lib. v. Cap. xxx. p. 449.—Edit. GRABE.

Ζητεῖτε, καὶ Εἰρήσεται.

MATT. vii. 7.

BY THE REV. REGINALD RABETT, A.M.

OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND VICAR OF THORNTON, LEICESTERSHIRE.

PUBLISHED BY R. B. SEELEY AND W. BURNSIDE :

AND SOLD BY L. AND J. SEELEY,

FLEET STREET, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXV.

ANTHONY; LATEINOS;

of the

ONLY PROPER AND APPELLATIVE NAME OF THE

M.A.N.

WHICH IS THE ONLY NAME IN THE HISTORY OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE

OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE NAME OF THE



PREFATORY ADDRESS

TO

PROTESTANTS.

It is not a new subject to which I now invite your special attention, but the *establishment of an old one* ; yet the *Barrier of prejudice* is as *high* as *Babel*, and *Unbelief* is as in the *days of Jerusalem*, so that men will not believe a *Matter*, though a *Man* declare it unto them. Nevertheless, the *Word of God* is *true*, and changeth not, and the wisdom of *Solomon* testi-
fieth, that, ¹ “ It is the *Glory of God* to *conceal* a thing ; but the *honour of Kings* is to *search out* a *Matter*.” Now the *secret* of the ² Number “ 666 ” is “ *a Matter* ” not only befitting the Ministers of the Gospel to understand, and “ *search out*,” or limited to the Apostolic Age : but it most especially concerned the “ *ten Kings* ” (and Kingdoms) which had ³ “ *one mind* ” and “ *gave their power, and strength, and Kingdom unto the Beast*,” namely, the *Papal*

¹ Prov. xxv. 2—5.

² Rev. xiii. 18.

³ Ibid xvii. 13, 17.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

Roman Hierarchy, during the predicted period of ¹ “1260 Days” of Prophetical years. We know, then, that *Protestant England* was formerly one of the “*Ten Kings*” and Kingdoms, which supported the *Ecclesiastical Tyranny of Papal Rome*, but that she has been providentially broken off from the galling yoke and *dominion of the Papacy* for upwards of three centuries past, and has *protested*, (solemnly, and *nationally protested*,) against the *Theocratic and Despotic Power*, (both *temporal and spiritual*,) of the *Sovereign Roman Babylonish Pontiff*, as *Luther, Calvin, Wickliff, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer*, and a *Host of Reformers and Martyrs* have *witnessed* by a good confession before God, and before “*a cloud of Witnesses*,” even unto the Death. O, then, that it might be the good pleasure of our *Sovereign Lord, the King of Great Britain*, with his *Counsellors of State*, and the *Nobles of these Realms*, (as it was of KING JAMES I. in his “*Premonition*,” and of ² *Lord John Napier, Peer of Marchiston*, in the year 1593,) to “*search out this Matter*,” and to see whether *Protestantism* or *Popery* can stand the *Test of Scriptural Investigation*. Since the days of the GLORIOUS REFORMATION, THE BIBLE has been the joy of our Land; it has been the bright resplendent SUN in our Religious Firmament; dispelling the dark clouds of *Popery, Ignorance*, and *barefaced Infidelity*: it has been a Light of Glory

¹ Revelations xii. 6, 14.

² “A plain discovery of the whole Revelation of St. John, &c. By John Napier, Lord of Marchiston.” *Fifth Edition*. Edinburgh. 1645.

TO PROTESTANTS.

to those who sat in darkness and the Shadow of Death; its genial Rays have been shed in rich abundance (not only over the *British Isles*, but over the *whole surface of the Globe*,) by the agency of the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, the *Missionary*, and many other religious Societies; the HOLY SCRIPTURES having been *Translated* (not into the *Latin Vulgate* for the [NOW] *Church of Rome*, but) into upwards of 160 different *Languages* and *Dialects*.

The *British Reformation Society* is lending its Salutary aid for *Ireland*, a Country, the People of which, if *moderately instructed* in the *Holy Scriptures*, would, by the grace of God, presently discover the *Horrors* and *Deformities of Popery*, cast away its galling chains, which are infinitely worse than the *fetters of Africa*, (for the fetters of the soul, are worse than those of the body,) and leave its dark, deluding, and *mysterious Priesthood*, as the *People of England* did at the *glorious Reformation*, and also in the well-known Period of 1688, since which, (TILL NOW,) *Popery* has hid her *Dragon Mouth* in ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, and WALES, and *skulked off to the unhappy shores of IRELAND*, and *this, this is the cause of Ireland's woes*. *Ye cannot serve God and the Pope!* Shall we, then, as *Protestants of Great Britain*, in this enlightened and religious Age, assist in bringing back the "*Dark Ages*" of *Popery*? Shall we allow the *Word of God* again to be ¹ "*clothed in sackcloth*," that is, *limited to the Language of Popery*, which is LATIN? Shall we

¹ Revelations xi. 3.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

foster the "*cunningly devised Fable*," that the *Protestant Religion* and *Popery* are the same in substance? No, my *Protestant* friends, this is the "*device of Satan*," causing you to "*BELIEVE A LIE*" as you will easily perceive in *St. Paul's fore-warning to the Thessalonians*, which, when you have read, *Remember* that is the *exact Portrait of the Pope* and *Popery* as drawn by the *Pen of Inspiration*: ¹ ("for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope!")

² "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, *that ye be not soon shaken in mind*, or be troubled, neither by *spirit*, nor by *word*, nor by *letter* as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. LET NO MAN DECEIVE YOU BY ANY MEANS: for THAT DAY shall not come, EXCEPT there come A FALLING AWAY first, and that MAN OF SIN be revealed, the SON of PERDITION; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that HE AS GOD SITTETH in the TEMPLE OF GOD, shewing himself that HE IS GOD. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know WHAT withholdeth that HE might be revealed in HIS TIME. For the MYSTERY of INIQUITY doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall THAT WICKED be

¹ Romans xv. 4.

² 2 Thess. ii. 1—12.

TO PROTESTANTS.

revealed, whom THE Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even HIM, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; BECAUSE they received not THE LOVE OF THE TRUTH, that they might be saved. And FOR THIS CAUSE GOD SHALL SEND THEM STRONG DELUSION, that they should BELIEVE A LIE: that they all might be damned who BELIEVED NOT THE TRUTH, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

We see then the Reason why the *Papal Antichristian Power* has arisen; namely, to *verify this prediction*, and others coincident with it, as set forth in the *Book of the Revelation* of St. John; for, as the *Primitive Christian Church* was founded on "THE TRUTH," so it was foretold by St. Paul that the time would come when a "falling away" from "THE TRUTH" would "FIRST" take place; "because they received not the love of THE TRUTH." "And for this cause God shall send them STRONG DELUSION, that they should BELIEVE A LIE." Now what "STRONGER DELUSION" could be "SENT" to any man, or Nation, than the "belief" that the *Pope of Rome* is the *true Vicar of Christ*, at the same time that he is the TRUE ANTICHRIST? What greater "LIE" can be "believed?" what greater "deceivableness of unrighteousness" can be set forth to men, than their "believing" that the *Pope of Rome*, who is the "*Mystery of Iniquity*," is the

PREFATORY ADDRESS

“*Mystery of Godliness*” and the *representative of Christ*? when at the same time St. Paul calls him in the above words; “*The Man of Sin,*” “*the Son of Perdition,*” “*the Mystery of Iniquity,*” “*that wicked,*” to be revealed, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, (viz. St. Peter’s at Rome,) “*shewing himself that he is God.*” And will ye not believe that the Pope is *very Antichrist*? If ye will not, may I not well say unto you, what *Christ* said to the *Jews* on another occasion: “*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures?*” for the *Event* has followed the *Prophecy* as clearly as the Sun at noon-day, and this Prophecy of the coming of the “*Man of Sin*” is accordingly fulfilled by the *Revelation of the Pope* at ROME, he being the *Beast* with “¹*TWO HORNS like a LAMB,* and HE SPAKE as a “*DRAGON;*” a character most clearly foretold, but *not fully revealed* till the *sixth Century*, that is, in the Reign of the *Emperor Justinian*, A. D. 533. Those, therefore, who consent to *purchase the pardon of their Sins* from the *Pope* for money, or from his *Cardinal Legates*, or from the *Priests* of his *Roman Church*, and those who *remit them* at such a price, are not “*the children of God,*” but of *Simon Magus*, the *Magician*, and will receive his *Reward*,² “*because they think that the Gift of God may be purchased with money:*” and “*because God hath sent them strong delusion to believe this lie.*”

¹ Revelations xiii. 11.

² Acts viii. 20.

TO PROTESTANTS.

Lend your Ears, then, *Protestants of England*, and consider attentively that it is "*the Honour of Kings*," as the "*nursing Fathers of the Church*," to understand and "*search out*" the "*MARK*," or "*NAME*" of the "*MAN*" whose *Number* is "666," to avoid *his Punishment*; for it is written by St. John, ¹ "*If any man WORSHIP the Beast and his Image, and receive his Mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy Angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who WORSHIP the Beast and his Image, and WHOSOEVER receiveth the MARK of his NAME.*" Remember, then, that the "*MARK*" or "*NAME*" of *this Beast*, is, *LATEINOS*; forasmuch as *Papists* have canonized the *LATIN Language* for the *special use* of the *CHURCH of ROME*, at the *Council of Trent*; and all *Europe* knows that they *Latinize* in every thing of an *Ecclesiastical nature*, and that, *not of Commandment from Christ, or his Apostles, but from their own free choice*: wherefore, *those who are the strict followers of the Pope* "*WORSHIP*" him, by *kissing his Foot*, which is an *indispensable ceremony at Rome*; they acknowledge *Him*, and none other, as their *rightful Sovereign*; they adopt *his Latin Language*, (which is the *Mark of unity* among

¹ Revelations xiv. 9—11.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

Papists,) and pronounce *him* to be the true Vicar of Christ : therefore, as the *Pope* is the *successor* of the *Pagan LATIN* or *Roman Emperors* in their *literal Kingdom*, and *Office* of “*Pontifex Maximus*,” and as he has *canonized their Latin Language*, in preference to the *Italian*, and *GREEK original*, so is the *Pope* in every possible sense the *Image of old Rome* ; for *Papal Rome* has adopted *Image-worship* without end, and those who do not *literally “worship”* the *Person* of the *Pope* by *kissing his foot*, acknowledge *his right to this “worship”* and therein “*receive the Mark of his Name*,” and consequently come under the above *condemnation*. Let History then furnish us with the melancholy details of the Life and death of *Cardinal Beaufort*, for one example ; and of the great *Cardinal Wolsey* for another, of those miserable and infatuated beings who have ‘strengthened themselves in the strength of the Pope, and *trusted* in the *shadow* of *ROME*,’ and who have most implicitly “*received*” the *Latin Ecclesiastical “Mark*,” and say if *Papal Rome* can give *infallible comfort* in a dying hour ? Did not “*God send them STRONG DELUSION that they should believe a lie ?*” in despite of all that *Papists* have endeavoured to persuade Protestants to the contrary, saying, ‘*there is no salvation out of the Church of Rome ?*’ *Wolsey’s* own signature was ‘*Card^{lis}. Ebor. Miserrimus* ;’ and this would be the general, the universal signature of *Papists*, (‘*Miserrimus—the most wretched*,’) if the heart would speak out : for they have not ¹ “*subscribed with their*

¹ Isaiah xliv. 5.

TO PROTESTANTS.

hand to the *Lord*, saying, *I am the Lord's* ;” but to the *Pope*, their *Sovereign Pontiff*, who is the “MAN” who hath ¹ “TWO HORNS like a LAMB, and HE SPAKE as a DRAGON ;” who “*deceiveth them that dwell upon the Earth* :” yet his Name is LATEINOS and his Number “666.” ² If “Paul’s spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city” (*Athens*) “*wholly given to IDOLATRY* ;” or, as it is in the margin, “*full of IDOLS* :” and *Athens* was at that moment in a *Pagan state* ; how would the Apostle’s spirit be stirred in him, if he were to behold the *City of Rome* in its *Papal state* ? for it is “*wholly given to idolatry*,” and “*full of idols* :” would he not brand it with “*Anathema Maran-atha* ?”

Be it known unto you, therefore, my Protestant friends, that under the *Reign of Popery*, the clouds of divine vengeance hung over *England* thickening with wrath, as was manifestly the case in the *Reigns of Queen Mary and the Stuarts* ; and are not *Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Infidel France*, exhibited to our view as *specimens* of the miseries of *Popish Kingdoms* in our time ? If they be not, tell me where they may be found ? Shall we presume to say that *Ireland* is an *exception* ? Can any good thing come out of *Rome* ? Did any country of *Europe* ever prosper under *Popery* ? The man who can believe it, is ignorant of his *Bible*, of *History*, and of himself, and is an *Infidel* in principle, and a liberal in heart, and would as soon patronize the

¹ Rev. xiii. 1, 12.

² Acts xvii. 16.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

KORAN AS THE BIBLE. The *Church of Rome* is a *Church of Blood*, as *St. John* predicted of her: ¹“ I saw the woman drunken with the *Blood of the Saints*, and with the *Blood of the Martyrs of Jesus*.” ²“ And IN HER was found the *Blood of Prophets* and of *Saints*, and of all that were slain upon the Earth.” Does not the *History* of the *infernal Tribunal* and *Prison-House*, called by the *Pope* and his *Councils*, the “ *HOLY INQUISITION*,” furnish us with the *foul fact*? Do not the *bloody Papal wars* and *massacres* of *hundreds of thousands* of *Christians* throughout all *Europe* EXCEED the blood shed in the wars of nations for national conquest? If then *Protestant England* expects the *continuance* of *peace* and *prosperity*, *temporal* and *spiritual*, she will *away with Popery* as with the *Plague*, by prayer to God on the one hand, and by every legitimate means on the other; for the *Protestant Throne of England* can never be established in righteousness by the *friends* of the *Papacy*, for they are the *secret*, *dark*, and *deadly enemies* of *God* and the *King*, as the *Jesuits* have ever proved to *England* and the surrounding nations. Look at her children in our *British Houses of Parliament*! are they not *impudent children*, answerable to their *Mother, Rome*? who is called by *St. John*, by way of eminence, ³“ MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” This was the theolo-

¹ Rev. xvii. 6.

² Ibid. xviii. 24.

³ Ibid. xvii. 5.

TO PROTESTANTS.

gical opinion of ¹ *King James* the First, as set forth in his Royal ‘*Premonition*’ to *Protestants*, pages 309, 310, in these words, ‘This place,’ (viz. Rev. xvii. and xviii.) says the King, ‘doth *clearly* and *undeniably* declare that *ROME* is, or *shall* be THE SEAT of *that* ANTICHRIST. For *no Papist* now denieth that by *BABYLON*, here, *ROME* is *directly* meant,” &c. What is it then which *Irish Papists* demand from the *Protestant Government of England*? *Religious toleration*? No, they know not toleration; for *Rome Papal* has *ever* been, and will *always* be INTOLERANT. PERSECUTION is the *essence* of her existence; for *this* is her sovereign remedy for those whom she *denominates* Heretics. The evil *Spirit of Antichrist* is in her, and therefore, she “goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom she may devour:” for seeing that she “received not the love of the truth,” “*God hath sent her* STRONG DELUSION *that she should* BELIEVE A LIE:” and now she propagates the “lie” which her unbelief produced, by “the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” Nevertheless, *God* hath not left himself without a witness in these times, for *wheresoever* the Gospel is faithfully preached, *Popery* can never take deep root, nor raise her scarlet banner; for though she may howl and roar, yet “the Lion of the tribe of Judah” is our defence, and He it is who

¹ See Bishop Moreton’s Church of Rome. Chap. iv. sect. 15. page 74. Second edition, London, 1628.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

giveth us ¹ “ *the victory over the Beast, and over his Image, and over his Mark, and over the Number of his Name.*” Ignorance is the fruitful soil of *Papists*, as weeds grow most luxuriantly where cultivation is neglected, and this remark is abundantly true with reference to the Irish peasantry ; but give these poor people *the Bible*, in their own *Native Language*, which the *Popish Priests* have so long and rigidly kept from them, with the *same liberty of conscience which Protestants have in England*, and the *Priests of Rome* will soon perceive, as when *St. Paul* preached at *Ephesus*, that their *Papal* ² “ *craft is in danger,*” for they know that “ *by this craft they have their wealth.*” The *Ecclesiastical Polity* of *Rome* is, to keep the *Bible* as a *sealed book* ; to which end they have it in the *Latin Language*, which is *unknown* to any but the learned ; and therefore poor and ignorant *Papists* look upon the *Bible* as a *Book of Mysteries*, which *none* but the *Priests of Rome* can possibly understand or unfold. However, *St. Paul*, who was a *free-born Roman*, and the *chief Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, and wrote the *Epistle to the Romans*, would not suffer the *Apostles* to *speak* in an “ *unknown tongue*” (which *Latin* is), “ *in the Church* ;” and *England*, better instructed since THE REFORMATION, has followed the precept of *St. Paul*, by giving the people THE BIBLE in their own native Tongue, which has immortalized our Nation above every other Nation in Europe. And I feel pleasure in stating, (though I hope I shall be excused for expressing it

¹ Rev. xv. 2.

² Acts xix. 25, 27.

TO PROTESTANTS.

here,) that one of my Ancestors, in the time of *James the First*, was engaged in the *present Translation* of our *English Protestant Bible*, as set forth in the general Introduction to Bishop Mant's Bible in the following words—

‘ In the conference held at *Hampton Court* in 1603, before *King James the First*, between the *Episcopalians* and *Puritans*, Dr. *Reynolds*, the Speaker of the Puritans, requested his Majesty that a *New Translation of the Bible might be made,*’ &c.

‘ The names of the Persons, and places where they met, together with *the portions of Scripture* assigned to *each Company*, were as follows, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th. To the last mentioned Company (the 6th), consisting of *seven* individuals, *the Epistles of St. Paul*, and the *other canonical Epistles*, were assigned at *Westminster*, namely, 1st. Dr. *William Barlow*, of Trinity Hall in Cambridge, Dean of Chester, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln; 2nd Dr. *Hutchinson*; 3rd. Dr. *Spenser*; 4th. Mr. *Fenton*; 5th. Mr. *Rabbet*; 6th. Mr. *Sanderson*; 7th. Mr. *Dakins*. The work was begun in the spring of 1607.

It does not appear to me that any one Commentator has ever placed the subject of the Number 666 beyond the possibility of future Controversy, for old Dr. *Henry More*, after he had so clearly established the *ancient use* of the *Diphthong*, or *Broad ei*, in *Lateinos*, has followed after, and *approved the Square Root System of Mr. Potter*, thus leaving the *only Proper and Appellative Name LATEINOS* to the

PREFATORY ADDRESS

attack of *Papists* and others, by involving the subject in *new speculations* and *difficulties*, which have multiplied so greatly and continuously, that there appeared to be no end to them ; but there can be *only ONE* successful person, and that was IRENÆUS, who *lived in the second century*, and who was almost contemporary with *St. John*, being the Disciple of *Polycarp*.

If it should be thought by any that I have been too severe in my animadversions on any Individuals whose Names are set forth in this work, I can only say, that (*excepting Popery*) it has been far from my intention ; but that as the Persons herein mentioned have publicly written their opinions on this Number 666, which are now before the world, therefore, it became necessary for me, in the *vindication of Irenæus*, to bring forward their Names, and to show how inconsistent their various speculative opinions are with each other, and with the words of *St. John*. If *truth* be not distinguishable from *error*, of what use is *God's word* to any *Nation* or *Individual* ? But as the *Holy Spirit* has expressly assured us, concerning the Book of Revelations, that, ¹ “ *If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book : and if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this Book :* ” on the contrary, it is said by *St. John*, ² “ *Blessed is he that*

¹ Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

² Ibid. i. 3.

TO PROTESTANTS.

readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein :" wherefore, to say the least, it must be *more expedient to honour God by the confirmation of that which HE hath spoken, by his inspired servant St. John, seconded as it is by the Christian Father IRENÆUS, than that which any man hath written, whether negatively, positively, or injudiciously against it.* If then I have been led to a more perfect understanding and clearing of this Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, from its manifold polemical incumbrances, as weeds that surround a choice plant, and prevent its appearance and growth ; it is because GOD hath enabled me more diligently to "*search out the matter,*" and to "*show the interpretation*" of this *Mystical " MARK " or " NAME,*" which is, LATEINOS. To GOD, then, be the glory, and to *his Name* the praise, for *this " wisdom "* and "*understanding.*" That this Treatise on the Number 666, may be made useful to the serious inquirer after TRUTH, and the turning of many from the *Kingdom of Papal darkness, to the Kingdom of God's dear Son,* is the earnest prayer and desire of your humble servant for Christ's sake,

REGINALD RABETT.

*Bramfield Hall, Suffolk,
June, 1835.*

INTRODUCTION.

As so many eminent Authors have already preceded me with their various opinions (and I might say endless speculations) concerning the *Proper* and *Appellative Name* of the *Beast*, which is declared by *St. John* to be that of ¹“ a MAN,” and the “ *Number of his Name* ” — “ *Six Hundred Threescore and Six*,” [in Greek character, $\chi\xi\varsigma'$,] it might perhaps be supposed, either that the NAME of the MAN could not be ascertained by the means of “ *Wisdom* ” and “ *Understanding* ; ” or, that the subject has been already so far exhausted, that nothing more could possibly remain to be stated by any future writer. Such an inference, however, may rather be expected from those who heedlessly adopt the speculations of fanciful men, than from the careful Investigator of Religious Truth.

Pilate indeed said to *Christ*, ²“ *What is TRUTH?* ” but *he did not wait for an ANSWER*. May I then be

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

² John xviii. 38.

allowed to hope that such inconsistency and such want of candour will be carefully avoided by all my readers? Should the *Subject* of the NAME and NUMBER of the MAN be deemed by any UNIMPORTANT, I must then shelter myself under the *auspices* of—

ST. JOHN the *Divine* . . . and of the pious and learned IRENÆUS: of *Hyppolytus Martyr* . . . *Aretas* . . . *Feuardentius* . . . *Ticonius* . . . *Primasius* . . . *Vitringa* . . . *Bengelius* . . . *Piscator* . . . *Grotius* . . . *Fungerus* . . . *Vignier* . . . *Broughton* . . . *Potter* . . . *Mede* . . . *Poole* . . . *Diodati* . . . *Down* . . . *Dr. Henry More* . . . *Bishop Newton* . . . *Lowman* . . . *Daubuz* . . . *Leigh* . . . *Brightman* . . . *Durham* . . . *Whiston* . . . *Dr. Fulke* . . . *Pyle* . . . *Kershaw* . . . *Bishop Dounham* . . . *Galloway* . . . *Jurieu* . . . *Dr. Wells* . . . *Dr. Cressener* . . . *Dr. Hales* . . . *Dr. Gill* . . . *Dr. Wall* . . . *Reader* . . . *Lord Napier* . . . *Archdeacon Wrangham* . . . *Matthew Henry* . . . *Burkitt* . . . *Flemming* . . . *Dr. Doddridge* . . . *Dr. Guise* . . . *Scott* . . . *Fuller* . . . *Bicheno* . . . *Kett* . . . *Dr. Adam Clarke* . . . *Faber* . . . *Professor Lee* . . . *Wm. Cuninghame, Esq.* . . . *Fry* . . . *Gauntlett* . . . *Jones* . . . *Butt* . . . *Simpson* . . . *Keith* . . . *Croly* . . . *Dr. Parry* . . . *Dean Woodhouse* . . . *Thurston* . . . *Archbishop Laud* . . . *Cardinal Bellarmine* . . . *Bishop Walmesley* . . . *Bishop Bossuet* . . . *Calmet* . . . and many other writers whose Names I have omitted, for *these* may surely suffice to show the importance of the subject in the esteem of men who have thought it worthy their careful investigation; although their conclusions have generally been more in accordance with their own favourite views, than consistent with

those of Holy Writ. Much instability of opinion must necessarily have been produced by successive publications of men distinguished by an equal variety of sentiment and versatility of talent: in proof of this position I will venture to adduce the following illustrative examples.

The CONFESSION of Mr. CROLY, *in the year 1827*, is the following.

¹ ‘It may have been known to the reader, that the *Number of the Beast*, “the 666,” has exercised more intellects than perhaps any ONE problem, sacred or profane, that ever perplexed the human mind. Whole treatises have been written upon it. It occupies a considerable space in almost every Commentary on the *Apocalypse*. The inquiry and the FAILURE began so early as IRENÆUS, in the second century, and have been perpetuated to our days by a multitude, among whom were many of the most undeniable learning and sagacity; HITHERTO NO SATISFACTORY SOLUTION HAS BEEN GIVEN.’

The foregoing remarks of Mr. Croly are comparatively true: but IRENÆUS evidently had the *Proper* and *Appellative Name* of the MAN, [LATEINOS,] upon his lips when he said, ² ‘LATEINOS NOMEN HABET SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX NUMERUM: et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum Regnum HOC habet VOCABULUM. LATINI enim sunt qui

¹ CROLY on the Apocalypse, ‘The Vision of the Church.’ page 222. London, 1827.

² IRENÆ. Adver. Hæres. lib. V. cap. xxx. page 449. Edit. Grabe. Oxon. 1702.

NUNC REGNANT ;' and although this Christian Father has *conjectured Three Names*, viz. TEITAN, LATEINOS, and ΕΥΑΝΘΑΣ, *before the Event* [*Ante Eventum*,] that is, *before the Rise, Progress, and Establishment* of the LATIN PAPAL CHURCH of ROME, which had neither *place nor power to rise till after the downfall of the old ROMAN IMPERIAL POWER*, which was *flourishing* in the SECOND CENTURY, in which IRENÆUS *lived and wrote*. Yet AFTER the EVENT, [*POST EVENTUM*,] that is, *after the full Revelation of the "MAN of SIN," the "SON of PERDITION,"* in the year A. D. 533, according to the ¹ *Imperial Edict of Justinian to Pope John*, the old Pagan Roman Power being already *destroyed by Barbarians*, the PAPACY began to rise out of the ROMAN or LATIN EARTH: and what IRENÆUS only *conjectured* in the *Second*, is manifest enough in the *Nineteenth Century*, inasmuch as the *Appellative Name* Πατῆνος is *every way applicable* to the ROMAN or LATIN 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,' as well as to *every individual Papist* through the *whole duration* of the LATIN PAPAL KINGDOM, and, therefore, Mr. Croly is mistaken in his *assertion* concerning '*the FAILURE of IRENÆUS*,' who has, on the contrary, given us the *true Appellative* of the numbered MAN in the *proper and descriptive Name*, LATEINOS.

It is here worthy of remark, how very far superior the *conjecture* of IRENÆUS on this *Name and Number 666*, was (even *before the Rise or Existence* of the PAPAL HIERARCHY), to that of any other writer who

¹ CUNINGHAME on the Apocalypse, page 201, second edit. London, 1817.

has succeeded him ; so much so, that those who have followed him have invariably traced the *numbered Beast* to ROME ; while *all others* who have gone into devious labyrinths and foolish speculations, have lost his *proper* and *descriptive Name*, in their failure to convince themselves that the *iota circumflexed*, as *î*, is *equivalent* to the *Diphthong* or *broad ei* or *ê*, in LATEINOS, which it certainly is, according to the best *Ancient Orthography* both among the GREEKS and LATINS, as *Λατῆινος*, *Λατῆνος*, *Λατῖνος*. For authorities, see CHAPTER XV.

I shall next transcribe the opinion of the learned VITRINGA concerning the No. 666, as set forth by *Mr. Croly* with the observations of the latter ; for I believe that, in point of intrinsic wisdom and research, the former takes the precedence of almost all other Authors since the time of *Irenæus* ; although I have *certain objections* to VITRINGA himself concerning the *Name* אֲדֹנִיָּקָם, ADONIKAM, inasmuch as in that View *he follows not the example of IRENÆUS*.

¹ ‘ VITRINGA, undoubtedly a man of understanding, and of the most extensive learning, approaches it with an almost superstitious awe. His apostrophe is solemn and eloquent.’

“ Here is wisdom, let him that hath understanding count the Number of the beast.” Yes, here is wisdom. Let the man, gifted by grace with such gifts, here display the acuteness of his genius, the clearness of his sagacity, the depth of his spiritual knowledge, things, which fall to the lot of few ; but

¹ Croly on the Apocalypse. Pages 223—225.

for which he who by grace possesses them, will here find abundant exercise. If I have made any progress in the knowledge of divine things, which might be supposed from my long study and labour, and from the office, publicly conferred upon me; I still dare not presume so far upon my ability and knowledge, as to arrogate that highest rank of intelligence and sagacity, (*supremum illum intelligentiæ et perspicacitatis gradum*,) which the *Holy Spirit* seems to demand in those who are destined to explain the ‘*number*.’ For nothing can be more evident, than that an intellect of a higher and more divinely awakened kind, (*divinioris et præstantioris mentis acumen*,) is here demanded, than in interpreting any other part of this book of prophecy.’

‘He proceeds to say, that he might “*modestè declinare*,” give up the attempt from a justified feeling of humility; but that the reader naturally expects some elucidation. He then goes through a crowd of the conjectures of his predecessors, names, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Latin*; numbers squared and cubed; disproves them all, and finally rests upon the extraordinary guess אֲדֹנִיקָם, for the equally extraordinary reason that *Adonikam* is said in *Ezra*,¹ to have had a *family of six hundred and sixty-six*.’

My 1st *Objection* to the NAME, ADONIKAM, is, that *although it is the Name of a MAN*, nevertheless *it ought to have been written in GREEK LETTERS*, as Αδωνικάμ, and *not in HEBREW*, as אֲדֹנִיקָם, according to the ORIGINAL TEXT of St. JOHN . . . χξς’,

¹ *Ezra* ii. 13.

and the *example* of IRENÆUS, whose THREE Names are all of them written in *Greek Characters*, as Τρίταν, Δατῆινος, Ευανθας.

My 2nd *Objection* is, That although ADONIKAM is the *name* of a MAN, it cannot be applied in an APPELLATIVE OR DESCRIPTIVE SENSE to *any* TEMPORAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL POWER, OR KINGDOM whatsoever, either in St. John's time or *since*; and that the *individual Hebrew Letters* of the Name of *this Man* are very far from producing the Number 666. The *hypothesis* of VITRINGA seems rather to set us upon finding the *Number of a Hebrew Family* consisting of 666, than the *Greek Number* of a *Man's Name*; for the *Family* of Adonikam, after their return from *Babylon*, were registered by *Ezra* at ¹ 666, but by *Nehemiah*, at ² 667, therefore, it will be necessary to decide *which* of the *two Prophets* was the *best Registrar*. But the individual Letters of the Hebrew Name *Adonikam* produce the Number 765, consequently there is an end to the Name at once, in reference to the words of St. John which is to "*count the Number*" contained in the Name, and that Number is 666.

Mr. CROLY may anticipate my objection to *his hypothesis* from my *answers* to FABER . . LEE . . and CLARKE—and may I not add *Mr. Croly's own observations*, viz. that ³ "*The FIRST ERROR of the COMMENTATORS*" "*has arisen from their DISREGARD of the PLAIN MEANING of the ORIGINAL.*" This Mr. Croly tells us in the year 1827; and it had been

¹ Ezra ii. 13.

² Neh. vii. 18.

³ Croly on the Apocalypse. Page 226.

well had he only *attended to* "THE PLAIN MEANING of THE ORIGINAL" as IRENÆUS has done, *whose Testimony is subversive of Mr. Croly's* ¹ "INQUISITION," although Mr. Croly informs us, that, ² "The words LATEINOS and ROMIITH are USELESS; and belong to THE HEAP of MERELY CURIOUS COINCIDENCES." If the *two latter Names* "belong to the HEAP of MERELY CURIOUS COINCIDENCES," where shall we *class Mr. Croly's story* of "THE INQUISITION?" Shall we venture to affirm that IT IS a "FAILURE?" It is plain enough that the word "INQUISITION" is *not a GREEK but ENGLISH word*: nor is it the NAME of A MAN: nor does it contain the No. 666, according to "*the plain meaning of the Original*" Text, and, therefore, it cannot subserve the purpose intended by St. John, which is, by the means of "*wisdom*" and "*understanding*" to discover the *name* of a MAN the *individual Greek Letters of whose Name* must (when counted) exhibit the *exact Number* χξς' or 666, and, withal, it must be a *Name descriptive of the mysterious character of the MAN*, otherwise there can be no "*coincidence*" between the *Name of the Man* and the "*Number of his Name.*" I may now add—

The *confession of the Rev. G. S. Faber, in the year 1828, in his* ³ "*Sacred Calendar of Prophecy.*"

"Many have been the speculations, relative to the *Name* thus darkly propounded; some very plausible, and others very absurd: but *we shall vainly hope*

¹ Croly on the Apocalypse. Page 228.

² Ibid. Page 227.

³ *Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy.* Vol. iii. b. v. p. 226.

for success in explaining the sacred enigma, UNLESS we ATTEND MOST STRICTLY to THE TERMS in which it is conveyed."

Notwithstanding this *confession* of *Mr. Faber*, he has bewildered both himself and others, by endeavouring to *reconcile contradictions* : whereas, if he had only contented himself with *his OWN RULE*, as above, (which he had followed pretty closely in his *first work*, entitled ¹ "*A Dissertation on the Prophecies relative to the Great Period of 1260 years*," wherein he confirms the name *Λατῆινος* with all his might,) he would have *done well* ; because, it was *consistent* with the "*terms*" of *St. John*, and "*most strictly*" corroborated by the *early testimony* of the *Christian Father* . . *IRENÆUS*, who lived in the *second century*, and who evidently believed "*the NUMBER of a MAN*" to *imply* the '*name of a MAN*, which latter cannot be said *in any respect* concerning *Mr. Faber's hypothesis* of *APOSTATÈS*, because it has *not the least semblance to the Name of any MAN*.

The *confession* of *Dr. Burton* in his *Notes on the Greek Testament* [Rev. xiii. 18,] concerning the very numerous speculations relative to the mystic Number 666, is as follows :

[' Τον αριθμον.] *Irenæus* mentions the word *Λατῆινος*, the Letters of which make up the No. 666: but the *same number* has been *extracted from so many other words*, that it is *USELESS to ATTEMPT the SOLUTION.*'

The *Confession* of *Calmet* in his *Dictionary* under

¹ *Faber's Dissertation on the Prophecies, &c. Vol. ii. p. 328, 335.*

the head ANTICHRIST, (after mentioning a variety of *Names, Epithets, Words, and Sentences*, in which the *Number 666* is supposed to have been discovered,) is to the following Effect :

“ *Almost all Commentators* have tried their skill, *without being able to say POSITIVELY*, that *any ONE* has SUCCEEDED, in ascertaining the TRUE MARK, or the NUMBER of HIS NAME.”

The *Confession of Dean Woodhouse* in his ¹ “ *Annotatons on the Apocalypse*” in the Year 1828, concerning the *Number of the Beast*, is as follows,

“ *The Number of the Beast.*”

“ The consideration of this article has been kept back, and assigned to this its present place, because *I felt it out of my power* to pursue it with the *same hope of success as those that have gone before*. For I MUST STILL CONFESS, as *I did in my former work*, MY INABILITY TO SOLVE THIS ENIGMA.”

The *Dean* then observes,

“ With respect to the methods of interpretation hitherto employed, the *first* instance that occurs is that of *Irenæus*, who by the assortment of the Letters, of the Greek Alphabet, used numerically, obtained the names of *Λατῆivos, Εὐανθας, and Τῆιταν*. He preferred the first of these, but had little or no reliance upon it. His object must have been the idolatrous ROMAN or LATIN EMPIRE. *Bishop Newton*, and many others among the commentators, have adopted this word” (*Λατῆivos*) “ as involving the

¹ WOODHOUSE’S *Annotatons on the Apocalypse*, p. 304, 306, 307.

discovery required, applying it to the *Latin Church* and *Papal Hierarchy*."

"But *this mode of calculation* has *fallen into discredit*, by the *fact*, resulting from experience, that there is *no end* to the *multitude of names* which may be composed by *such fabrications*; and that not only the antichristian Chiefs, but the most eminent of our reformers may be, and have been thus designated by their adversaries."

"*Archdeacon Wrangham* has the merit of displaying in a very small compass, a learned and critical view of many attempts in the ancient languages, and by various modes of calculation, to devise names applicable to the mystery of the Number of the Beast. The facility with which these adaptations are made, has occasioned an infinite number of them. '*Scarcely*,' says he, '*has a single controversy started up, in which this accommodating number (666) may not be ranged on either side.*'"

"And we may add," says the *Dean*, "that NONE of them afford *that satisfactory conviction* which attends the PERFECT DISCOVERY of an HIDDEN MYSTERY. There is wanting that flash of illumination, that lively sense of having passed from darkness to light, which so delightfully affects us upon the SOLUTION of a WELL-FORMED ENIGMA."

"However, the learned *Archdeacon* has not yet thought proper to relinquish entirely the *mode of computation* practised by *Irenæus*, and has presented us with the word *Αποστατης*, thus acquired."

It had been well if *Dean Woodhouse* had confined

himself to the *terms of his own* CONFESSION—"I MUST STILL CONFESS," says the *Dean*, "as I did in my former work, MY INABILITY TO SOLVE THIS ENIGMA;" but he should not have thrown a direct STUMBLING-BLOCK in the way of ²"STUDENTS IN PROPHETICAL SCRIPTURE," by insinuating that the "MODE OF CALCULATION" (used by IRENÆUS) "HAS FALLEN INTO DISCREDIT." I would not invidiously wish to inquire *by whom*, or *through whom*, "THIS MODE OF CALCULATION HAS FALLEN INTO DISCREDIT;" but I would only here observe, that as St. JOHN wrote his "BOOK of THE REVELATION" in the GREEK LANGUAGE, and "the NUMBER of THE MAN," is written in GREEK CHARACTERS, χξς', so the *presumption* is that the NAME of the MAN must *likewise* be written in GREEK CHARACTERS answerable to the GREEK NUMBER—and as IRENÆUS was the *Disciple of* POLYCARP, and POLYCARP of St. JOHN—and that IRENÆUS was *confessedly* a GREEK FATHER of great distinction, who has left us his opinion in the writing of THREE Names in GREEK LETTERS, viz. Λατῆινος, Τέιταν, and Ευανθας, we are therefore *justified in believing* that the *Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, French, German, Spanish, Italian, English, and all other Languages* must be out of this Question. Further; "THE MODE of CALCULATING" GREEK NAMES and NUMBERS does not stand upon the *sole opinion of* IRENÆUS; but was *well known before* St. JOHN's time, or that

¹ WOODHOUSE, page 304.

² See the Dean's Title Page to his Annotations on the Apocalypse.

Apostle would not have *thus written* the No. 666, by $\chi\xi\varsigma'$; wherefore, this *present* "MODE of CALCULATION" remains unassailable until we are favoured by the DISCOVERY of a *better* "MODE of CALCULATION."

The GREEK Version of the OLD TESTAMENT called "the SEPTUAGINT," was *written long before the commencement of the CHRISTIAN ÆRA*, and we find that the Number 666 occurs TWICE in *that Version* written at full length, $\epsilon\xi\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\xi\eta\kappa\omicron\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\xi$, [See EZRA ii. 13; 1 KINGS x. 14,] hence it is clear that the GREEKS had a MODE of CALCULATING at *that time*, or how could they have expressed those Numbers in writing? In proof of this position Dr. S. T. Bloomfield in his *English Notes* appended to the GREEK TESTAMENT, on *this GREEK NUMBER* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ has quoted HEINRICH.

Rev. xiii. 18. $\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$.] "This (says *Heinrich*) is to be explained from the *Cabbala* of the *Jews*, and that part of it called *Gematria*. It means the number which is made up, by reducing the numeral power to *each* of the LETTERS of which the *name is composed*, and bringing it to a *sum total*. That ART, now held in merited contempt, WAS IN THE TIME of the APOSTLE held in GREAT HONOUR not only among the JEWS, but also the GREEKS, as we may collect from ARTEMID. ONEIR. i. 12." See more "in HEINRICH's elaborate *Excursus* IV. on the whole passage."

Consult also the following authorities,

SCAPULA in *Append. ad Lexicon*. "DE GRÆ-

Novum Testamentum Græcè. ARGENTORATIUM. Apud Wolfium. A. D. 1524	
..... Græcum. VENETIIS. Melchioris Sessæ. A. D. 1538	
..... Græcè. BASILÆ. Apud Nicholaum	
Brylingerum. A. D. 1548	
..... Græcum. Ex Bibliotheca Regia. LUTETIÆ. A. D. 1549	
..... Græcè et Latinè. Ad Romanæ correctionis	
amussim LUGDUNI. A. D. 1612	
..... Græcum Variantes Lectiones tam ex manu-	
scriptis quàm impressis Codicibus col-	
lectæ, &c. Studio et Labore Stephani	
Curcellæi RAPHELENGII. A. D. 1658	

Added to which our *Lord Jesus Christ* is, by St. *John* styled α and ω , i. e. “THE FIRST” and “THE LAST,” inasmuch as $\alpha\lambda\phi\alpha$ (α), being the FIRST *Numerical Letter* of the *Greek Alphabet*, is, with peculiar propriety, applied to our *Lord Jesus Christ*; and $\omega\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha$ (ω) being the LAST *Letter of the Greek Alphabet* is, with equal propriety, applied to CHRIST, as being “THE LAST.” Ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ α καὶ τὸ ω , ὁ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ καὶ ὁ ΕΣΧΑΤΟΣ Rev. i. 8, 11; xxi. 6; xxii. 13. Wherefore, we may very properly annex to *these facts*, certain other words of St. John, viz. “THY WORD IS TRUTH.” John xvii. 17.

And last of all I shall instance :

The Confession of Professor Lee, as exhibited in his “*Dissertations on Prophecy*” in the Year 1830, wherein he expresses a *doubt*, whether *this Number* $\chi\zeta\varsigma'$ is not a “*false reading*.”

The *Professor* thus writes :

¹ “Whatever the NUMERALS 666 may mean, we cannot have the least difficulty in ascertaining the scope of the passage. *Irenæus* gives (ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ)

¹ Lee's *Dissertations on Prophecy*. Rev. xiii. Diss. ii. Sec. iii. p. 328.

Lateinos among other interpretations, and this he applies to the *Roman power*, which, according to the numerical character of the Greek Letters, composing it makes up the number 666. Various other attempts have been made to ascertain these *Numbers*, and to fix *the Person here meant, which I pass over*; because I DOUBT whether ANY RELIANCE WHATEVER *can be placed on SUCH A METHOD of DEDUCTION*: and, when I BELIEVE *that the PASSAGE can be SATISFACTORILY made out WITHOUT IT*, MY OPINION IS, *that WE NEED NOT TROUBLE OURSELVES CONCERNING IT. I am not without MY DOUBTS*, however, whether THIS *is not A FALSE READING*, and whether IT *has not been INTRODUCED by some EARLY COPYIST*, for the *purpose of filling up what HE might have supposed to be ELLIPTICAL*. The passage now is: ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξς': and, TAKING AWAY *the NUMERALS*, we shall have καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ, parallel to the same Evangelist in Chap. viii. 44. καὶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ, which has given abundance of trouble to the Commentators.'

It is true that *Professor Lee* has (in the foregoing words) *alluded to IRENÆUS* from the *mention of his Name*, and that of LATEINOS; but can we reasonably suppose, therefore, that the *Hebrew Professor* had *carefully read over, or studied*, what that *Greek and Christian Father* had written on the subject of the Number 666, when he expressed his 'DOUBTS' concerning the authenticity of it, by insinuating that it is 'A FALSE READING,' and questioning '*whether ANY RELIANCE WHATEVER can be placed on SUCH*

a METHOD of DEDUCTION?' Surely he could not; because IRENÆUS has given us the THREE identical GREEK NUMBERS χξς', in the precise manner in which they are set forth in the TEXT of all the authentic copies of the Greek Testament: ¹καταλλήλως οὖν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔχει τὸν ἀριθμὸν χξς'.

And not only has IRENÆUS given us the THREE Greek Numerals χξς', but he has likewise assured us in the most unequivocal Terms that the Number 666, was delivered by *those who had seen St. John* 'face to face,' as well as set forth in ALL THE ANCIENT, the MOST APPROVED, and OLD SCRIPTURES, and that it was the true Number of the Beast: ²His autem sic se habentibus, et IN OMNIBUS ANTIQUIS et PROBATISSIMIS et VETERIBUS SCRIPTURIS NUMERÔ HÔC POSITÔ, et Testimonium perhibentibus his, qui FACIE AD FACIEM JOANNEM VIDERUNT, et ratione docente nos, quoniam NUMERUS NOMINIS BESTIÆ secundum GRÆCORUM COMPUTATIONEM per LITERAS quæ in eo sunt, SEXCENTOS habebit, et SEXAGINTA, et SEX.' Furthermore, as if with a view to remove all possible DOUBTS which might be subsequently entertained concerning the PERFECTION of the Number 666, and to guard us against any SPURIOUS NUMBER, we have his testimony in affirmation of the former, in opposition to the latter: ³' Oportet itaque tales discere, et ad VERUM recurrere Nominis NUMERUM: ut NON IN PSEUDOPROPHETARUM LOCO DEPUTENTUR. Sed SCIENTES FIRMUM NUMERUM qui à SCRIPTURA

¹ Irenæ. lib. V. cap. xxix. p. 446.

² Ibid. cap. xxx. p. 447.

³ Ibid. cap. xxx. p. 448.

ANNUNTIATUS EST, *id est*, SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX,' &c. Moreover, having summed up the Iniquity and Apostacy of the Numbered Beast, IRENÆUS concludes by saying, in the words of the *Ancients*:¹ ' *Et propter hoc* IN BESTIA VENIENTE recapitulatio sit *Universæ Iniquitatis et Omnis Doli, ut in ea* (scil. BESTIA) *confluens et conclusa Omnis Virtus Apostatica, in caminum mittatur ignis.* CONGRUENTER *autem et* NOMEN EJUS, *habebit* NUMERUM, SEXCENTOS SEXAGINTA SEX,' &c. IRENÆUS has still further certified to us by *three* several Examples that the NUMBER of the Beast is 666, as he says: ² 'ΕΤΑΝΘΑΣ *enim* NOMEN *habet* NUMERUM *de quo queritur:*' ' *Sed et* LATEINOS NOMEN *habet* SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX NUMERUM,' &c: . . . ' *Sed et* TEITAN,' &c. &c. As then IRENÆUS was one of the *Christian Fathers* who wrote expressly AGAINST ALL HERESIES, (' *contra omnes Hæreses,*') surely it is charging *Irenæus*, and THE HOLY SPIRIT with *deliberate falsehood* to ' DOUBT,' ' *whether* THIS NUMBER χξς', or 666, *is not* A FALSE READING.'

MEDE is not simply content with the words of *St. John*, but inserts parenthetically (lest we should be unmindful of the *Divine Agent* who indited these Numerals) ' INQUIT SPIRITUS.' . . . ³ ' *Hic est sapientia.*' (INQUIT SPIRITUS) ' *Qui intelligentiam habet, computet Numerum Bestiæ: numerus enim hominis est; et Numerus ejus 666.*'

Shall we then excuse the *Professor* for his non

¹ Irenæ. lib. V. cap. xxix. p. 446.

² Ibid. cap. xxx. p. 448, 449.

³ Rev. xiii. 18.

examination of this subject? What can we say? It is most extraordinary that one so highly gifted with the *knowledge of many languages* should not have perceived the *Truth of this Number*, so plainly exhibited before his eyes in the *reiterated words of IRENÆUS*, and so very often referred to by the *earliest and best Commentators* who have written upon the Number 666. I most assuredly thought that the *Professor of Hebrew* had more veneration for this *Christian Father* than to *relinquish his Testimony* upon so important a point, without a SUFFICIENT VOUCHER, but that *Voucher is evidently wanting*, and therefore, I must leave the Professor (as I have done in another part of this work) to *second Reflections*, more substantial and satisfactory. As I have answered *Professor Lee* more at large concerning the SPURIOUS NUMBER $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, or 616, so I must refer my Reader to that place. [See CHAPTER XIII.]

As ¹ *Mr. Potter's hypothesis* concerning the *Square Root* of the Number 666 has been so greatly extolled by the learned *Dr. Henry More, Mede*, and many celebrated Divines, I shall notice it in this place, and endeavour to show that it is untenable upon *scriptural grounds*, and that an *Algebraical or Geometrical solution* of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ is *foreign to the Interpretation*. St. John informs us that the ² "NAME of the Beast" "IS the NUMBER of a MAN," "and HIS NUMBER is 666." Now as we

¹ Potter's Interpretation of the Number 666. Printed at Oxford. 1647.

² Rev. xiii. 17, 18.

have already *established* from IRENÆUS the *correctness of the Number 666* ; so we can equally establish the *incorrectness of Mr. Potter's hypothesis* ; for, as the Number 666 is *not a perfect Square Number*, so *no perfect Square Root* can be *extracted* from it. It is manifest that the *Method* pursued by *Mr. Potter* is merely to find the *nearest Square Number* to the Number 666, which he would blindly lead us to suppose is 625, the *Square Root* of which being 25. Thus, *by Multiplying the Square Root* (25) into itself, and adding 41, we shall have the Number 666, which is true enough. But be it remembered that the Number 676 is a Square Number, the Root of which is 26, and which, when multiplied into itself, with 10 subtracted, will produce the Square of 666. And because the Number 666 is not a perfect Square of any *Integral Number*, and that the Number 26 is nearer to the Square Root of 666 than the Number 25, therefore, the Number 26 is to be preferred to the Number 25, if the Square Root system be allowed to prevail. But what, I would inquire, has *St. John* said about *the Root* of the Number 666 ? or, what concerning the *Cube Root* of the Number 666 ? or, what concerning *the Square Root* of the Number 666 ? The Apostle merely says, ¹“ *Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding COUNT THE NUMBER of the Beast; for it is THE NUMBER of a MAN, and HIS NUMBER is SIX HUNDRED THREESCORE AND SIX.*” We are plainly instructed by the *Holy Spirit* in these words in what way our “ *wisdom* ” and

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

“*understanding*” are to be exercised, viz. to “COUNT” THE NUMBER:” not to extract the *Cube* or *Square Root* of the *Number* 666. Is it possible to imagine that *St. John* could intend that the “NUMBER of the MAN,” or the “NUMBER of HIS NAME,” should be written upon a stone of 25 *Cubic Inches*, or 25 *Square* or *Solid Feet*, or 25 *Furlongs*? Or, is it possible that the *inspired Apostle* could allude to the *Perimeter*, *Altitude*, *Thickness*, or *Breadth* of the “MAN?” Strange as such questions may appear, yet they are involved in the solution of the Number 666, by means of the *Cube* and *Square Root*! If the hypothesis of *Mr. Potter* be correct, then the Number 25, being the *Square Root* of the Number (666—41,) the *Number* 25 (as the *object sought*) must become the SUBSTITUTE of the ORIGINAL NUMBER 666, the *Number* 666 being of *no other apparent use, than to EXTRACT the SQUARE ROOT of the Number* 625, and to *add the Fraction* $\frac{41}{45}$. The result of such an hypothesis must be this, That as the *two Greek Numerals* $\kappa\epsilon'$ are equal to the Number 25; because $\kappa' = 20$ and $\epsilon' = 5$; so the *two Greek Numerals* $\kappa\epsilon'$ *squared*, must be equal to, or become the *Representatives* of the *Three Greek Numerals* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, the admission of which hypothesis would be to allow our adversaries the *Romanists*, *double* and *treble* vantage ground, because such a *Cabbalistical Mode of Calculation* is nothing more than they would desire, for they know full well that the *adoption* of this *Square Root System*, would be in effect to *root up* the *Truth* of *St. John's hypothesis* concerning the

Number 666, inasmuch as no *perfect* or *settled* NAME of a MAN could be *thence derived*, no sound conclusion be drawn from such *Algebraical deduction*, such immeasurable and indeterminate Premises. Ex. Gr. If 41 must first be *subtracted from the original Number* 666 of St. *John*, the square Root produced from that Number, *not being an integral Number*, but *Fractional*, it is therefore, incomplete, and it is certain that there is no way of making the Number 25, the Square Root of the Number 666, but by the addition of a Fraction of $\frac{41}{45}$: so we are left in this deplorable dilemma at last, that 25 is NOT *the square Root of* 666, neither indeed can it be, because of the Imperfection occasioned by the necessary subtraction of 41, *from the original Number* 666. If the Number 25 were the genuine square Root of the Number 666, we should nevertheless be subject to this difficulty of Decision, as to WHICH of the Two *Greek Numbers* $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$, or $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, should be accounted for the genuine *Number of the Beast*? that is to say, whether the *Root* of the Number 666, which (according to *Mr. Potter's* hypothesis) would be $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$, should be the *Key* to the interpretation, because $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$ is the Root of 625, being equal to 25; or, the ORIGINAL NUMBER $\chi\xi\varsigma'$? If we should say the *former Greek Number*, then the *latter* must be *excluded*; if the *latter*, then the *former* must be *excluded*: So that we shall have arrived at *no certainty* at last, by the adoption of the *square Root of the Number*, for the *Number itself*. If *Mr. Potter* had endeavoured to prove, by the production of

examples, that the *Square Root* was practised by the *Greeks* when they sought to “COUNT THE NUMBER” of a *Man’s Name*, then we could have discovered how far such a system harmonized with *ancient Greek custom*, in reference to the subject under consideration; but as we know before-hand that no such Mode of calculation was ever used by the *Greeks*, or alluded to by *St. John*, when calculating the *Number of the Name of a Man*, so we are bound by the *inspired* words of *St. John*, and the example of *Irenæus*, &c. &c. as well as the authority of the *Greeks* themselves, to *reject* such an *Algebraical* and *Cabbalistical* Mode of calculation and interpretation; for *St. John* merely instructs us to . . . ¹“count the Number” (not to extract the *Square Root*) of the *Beast’s Name*.” Ex. Gr. If I were asked to “count the Number” 1000, would any one suppose that I should be led to understand by such a plain requisition, that I was to *extract* the *Square Root* of that Number? It would be the height of absurdity! and yet this is the *sum* and *substance* of *Mr. Potter’s renowned hypothesis*. What *analogy* can there be between ‘the Name of a Man, and the Number of his Name,’ and the *Square Root* of a Number which is *not a perfect Square*? A greater perversion of Mathematical Knowledge, as connected with the *Holy Scriptures*, could not have been set on foot. I have elsewhere noticed that the *three Numerals* which *St. John* had used to denote the Number 666, were *Greek*, as

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

χξς', and that the *Name of the Man*, corresponding with them, must *likewise be written in Greek Letters*, as *Irenæus* has certified, and, therefore, the *Method of calculating Greek Names*, which was in *common use among the Greeks*, in the *time of St. John*, must for ever exclude the Square Root System. In the sequel it will appear that the Square Root hypothesis has evidently been introduced by *Mr. Potter* to accommodate (not what St. John has said concerning the Number of the Beast, which is 666, but) an idea relating to certain *supposed coincidences* between the *six* following matters pertaining to the *Church of Rome*, and the *Square Root of 625*, which is 25.

¹ " 1. *Five and twenty Gates*, whether taken literally, or mystically for Churches to baptize in.

" 2. *Five and twenty Angels*, that is, Pastors.

" 3. *Five and twenty Titles* or Parishes.

" 4. *Five and twenty Cardinals*.

" 5. *Five and twenty thousand Furlongs*, the Perimeter of which Cube is the Circuit of *Rome*, as the Perimeter of the Cube twelve thousand Furlongs is the Circuit of *Jerusalem*.

" 6. *Five and twenty Articles of the Creed* which should be the Food of the Tree of Life to all Believers."

But I have already shown that the Number 26 is nearer the Square Root of 666 than the Number 25, and that the Number 666 is *not a perfect Square of any Integral Number*, and, therefore, to accommodate this Idea of *Mr. Potter*, with the Square Root hypothesis, we shall have this ludicrous result.

¹ See More's Works. Book v. Chapter 16. Sect. 8. p. 135. London, 1708.

1. 25 Gates, plus the *Fraction* of a Gate or Church to baptize in.

2. 25 Angels or Pastors, plus the *fraction* of an Angel or Pastor.

3. 25 Titles or Parishes, plus the *fraction* of a Title or Parish.

4. 25 Cardinals, plus the *fraction* of a Cardinal.

5. 25 Ibid.

6. 25 Ibid.

We conclude, therefore, that as 25 is the Square Root of the Number of 625, and not of 666, so the Square Root hypothesis of Mr. Potter, (ingenious as it may appear,) vanishes; for it is not tenable even upon Mathematical Principles, much less upon Scriptural ground.

I shall conclude my observations on Mr. Potter's scheme by a brief Memoir of the Author and his Treatise on the Number 666, which is written in Pencil by some one on the inside cover of a copy of his work in my Possession.

“*Francis Potter*, born in *Wiltshire*, educated at *Oxford*, succeeded his Father in the Living of *Kilmington*, Somerset, 1637. He was elected F. R. S. for a *curious hydraulic engine* he presented to that learned body: he was eminent as a *Painter*, but his *Treatise on 666*, *Oxford* 1642, does not reflect much credit on him as a Commentator, *rejecting*, as he did, the *obvious Name* $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and having recourse to a *Surd Root*, which is *absurd*.”

Daubuz has *rejected* the celebrated Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and preferred the *two Hebrew words* רומיית signifying

Roman, and סתור signifying *Mystery* (μυστήριον) both which words produce the Number 666, according to the *numerical value* of the *Hebrew Letters* of which they are composed ; but as ‘ROMAN’ and ‘MYSTERY’ are *not Names of Men*, so they must both be rejected on that account, according to the Text of St. John ; “ The Name of the Beast, or the Number of his Name ” . . . “ is the Number of a Man.” Moreover : the *Name of the Man* must *not be sought after* in the *Hebrew Language*, but in the Language in which St. John wrote his *Book of the Revelation*, which was GREEK, and the Number χξς’, which is Greek, must be counted according to the *Mode of Greek calculations* which existed in St. John’s time, of which many examples have been adduced. How far the *Hebrew word* רומיית may serve for identifying the *Kingdom* of the ‘ROMAN’ *Ecclesiastical Beast*, is another point ; but it is certain that it is *not the NAME of a MAN*, and, therefore, the Number 666 cannot be established without it be accompanied with some special proper Name. Besides which it is so palpably absurd to have a *Greek Number* given us, as χξς’, and then to turn to the *Hebrew Language* to explain it. If it were a *Hebrew Number* which was given us by St. John, as ססו, then a *Hebrew Name* would have sufficed for the interpretation ; but a *Greek Number* must have a *Greek Name*, as antecedent and consequent. If any two Names of Men could be found in the same Language in every respect applicable to the “ Mark,” “ Name,” and “ Number of the Beast,” it would be an argument why twenty

or fifty *Names* might be found for the same purpose ; but there is *only one Name of a Man* which can *fully* and *satisfactorily* unfold the *Ænigma*, whosoever may be the discoverer of it, and it must be in ¹*GREEK* not in *Hebrew* (*characters*,) as *Irenæus* testifies.

I have merely mentioned the *Names* of *Croly*
Vitringa . . . *Faber* . . . *Dr. Burton* . . . *Calmet* . .
Dean Woodhouse . . . *Professor Lee* . . . *Potter* . . .
and *Daubuz* in this part of my *Work*, with an intent to show that in the *very nature of their Opinions* and *Confessions* the subject of the Number 666 was *not incontrovertibly settled*, although noticed and written upon by them, and also to demonstrate, that as long as any *one* additional writer of fair pretensions can be allowed space enough to *conjecture some new name*, in any Language which is *not Greek*, with any tolerable hope of success ; or, *invalidate the Number* $\chi\xi\zeta'$ by the *production of an opposite one*, or the *Mode of calculating it* by some *Cabbalistic art of the Square or Cube Root* : so long the *Number of the Man*, which *primâ facie*, imports the *Name of the Man*, cannot be declared by any to rest beyond the reach of future disputation. If then what *Irenæus* wrote *conjecturally* in the *second Century*, be not enough to convince us of the *certainty* of the *Name* *LATEINOS* in the *nineteenth*, (and his Testimony has been corroborated again and again by subsequent writers in every age,) vain must be the attempt of any *Modern Writer* to *begin the Task* ; for the *MAN*,

¹ *Irenæ. lib. V. cap. xxx. p. 447. edit. Grabe. Oxon. 1702. and chap. xiv. p. 167. line 14, &c. of this work.*

(whose enigmatical Appellative Name is by the hypothesis *Λατῆivos*, and his Number $\chi\xi\zeta'$ or 666,) *began* his ecclesiastical Reign, at *Rome*, A. D. 533, and, consequently, the “1260 Days” of Years expired A. D. 1792. Those, therefore, who upon *existing evidence* will not acknowledge the Name *Λατῆivos* to be the *true Appellative* of the Numbered Beast, may as reasonably *Question the Fact* whether the *City of Jerusalem* be *really destroyed*, or not, even though *the EVENT* has *verified the prediction*. It would, I repeat, be equally inconsistent to *Question the fact* whether the PAPAL-ANTICHRIST, who is “*the Man of Sin*,” “*revealed*,” be actually revealed at *Rome*, or not, although a stream of concurrent Testimony, *beginning with Christ, St. Paul, and St. John*, and followed by *Irenæus*, has flowed down to us in the course of those *remarkable Events* which constitute the *fulfilment* of the *prediction*, according to the *time appointed*. Surely, then, *we* may with the *same certainty* look for the *destruction* of that *Papal-City*, *ROME*, in which *the Papists* glory so much, as the *Apostles* awaited the *destruction of Jerusalem*, or any other predicted Event.

It is most grievous to notice the numerous speculative errors which have from time to time arisen, and been most extensively circulated through the medium of men of Talent, concerning the Number 666, causing the *almost extinction* of the ORTHOGRAPHY . . . NAME . . . NUMBER . . . and GREEK MODE of CALCULATION, if we suffer ourselves to be distracted by the *conflicting testimony* of *Faber . . . Wrang-*

ham . . . Clarke . . . Bellarmine . . . Grotius . . . and Bossuet, for the ORTHOGRAPHY : of Calmet . . . Dr. Burton . . . and Croly, for the NAME : of Professor Lee and Archbishop Laud, for the NUMBER ; and of Dean Woodhouse . . . Potter . . . Daubuz and others, for the MODE OF CALCULATION. But happily we are not bound by their opinions, being exhorted by St. Paul to “prove all things,” (that is, not to take them upon trust without sufficient examination,) and then to “hold fast that which is good.” The more steadily, therefore, we look into the word of God, the more plainly we shall perceive the truth of these words : “one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass” . . . “till all be fulfilled.” Neither then the NUMBER nor the NAME of the Beast shall in any wise pass away, till the Time of his predicted reign be fulfilled, and HIS PROPER NAME fully discovered, and applied in an appellative sense to the MAN and HIS KINGDOM which are the special subjects of the prophetic Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666.

It is most certain that many scriptural words, names and Texts have been so perverted from their original meaning and intention ; that instead of establishing the Truths they were intended to convey to the mind, they have been cunningly laid as a Foundation for the most serious Heresies and destructive Errors. Wherefore it is most necessary that we pay the strictest regard even to the value of LETTERS, as well as words, &c., when such fearful consequences have resulted from too easy an acquiescence in those matters which on a little investigation are found to

be *palpably wrong*, and equally *subversive of Reason and Holy writ* and which ought never to have gained Credence till their merits had been more fairly canvassed.

Many have been the unavoidable interruptions which I have met with since the commencement of this work in the year 1830, arising from *Parochial Duties* and *other Engagements*. That *such a Work*, however, was *wanted* may be reasonably inferred from the *confessions of some writers*, and the palpable *failure of others*. But whether the good Providence of God has enabled me to place the subject of the Number 666 in that intelligible and *unanswerable point of view*, which is *so desirable*, is another question. That it is the *Proper Name of a MAN*, which is *here demanded*, is an *axiom* which cannot be denied. “*The NAME of the Beast*” “*is the Number of a MAN* ; and HIS NUMBER is SIX HUNDRED THREE SCORE AND SIX : ” and that, that Name is *Λατῆινος*, is, I believe, equally clear. I can, however, conscientiously affirm, that my sincere and sedulous study has been to set the subject of the “*Name*” and “*Number*” *beyond the possibility of alteration*, and to effect the *paramount* establishment of the *Name* of “*a MAN*,” namely, *LATEINOS*, as the *true* and *ONLY* *appellative* of the *Numbered Beast*, (Rev. xiii. 18.) and having strenuously attempted this, I must leave it to the candour of my Readers in general, and the supporters of Religious Truth in particular, to give their unbiassed Verdict according to the *unerring and unchanging Word of*

God, THE STANDARD to which I have constantly appealed in Confirmation of what has been advanced.

As the Promise of God made to *Daniel* the Prophet was, that, at ¹ “THE TIME OF THE END”—“KNOWLEDGE SHALL BE INCREASED;” so may this promise abide with God’s people and be believed; for He is a God who cannot lie: and they who wait on Him shall know assuredly that *this sacred Enigma* was written by the *finger of God*, at the hand of St. *John*, to the intent that *Papal Rome*, the *Mystic Babylon* of the *Revelations*, might come into remembrance before God, at “THE TIME OF THE END,” viz. the “1260 *Days*” of Years, which are NOW FULFILLED.

¹ Daniel xii. 4.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	iv to xxxv

CHAPTER I.

The SUBJECT proposed	1—8
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER II.

Introductory Remarks on Mr. Faber's hypothesis of APOSTATÈS, with OBJECTIONS	9—23
--	------

CHAPTER III.

OBJECTIONS to Mr. Faber's hypothesis continued, with Observations on the EPISÈMON ζ' and the CONTRACTION ζ .	24—39
--	-------

CHAPTER IV.

Further observations on the numerical CYPHER denominated <i>επισημον</i> Tav, or V, or ζ, or ζ', as used to denote the NUMBER 6, and to supply the vacuum occasioned by the absence of the OBSOLETE ÆOLIC DI-GAMMA	40—50
--	-------

CHAPTER V.

- On the RESULT of that Branch of Mr.
FABER'S hypothesis, which IDENTIFIES
the EPISÈMON ζ' with the CONTRACTION ζ 51—60

CHAPTER VI.

- On the THREE EPISÈMA, with a numerous
selection of authorities for the use of
the MARK ['] OVER the EPISÈMON OR
CYPHER ζ' 61—72

CHAPTER VII.

- On the PROPER USE of the MARK OR AC-
CENT, when placed above or below
the επισημον Tav, or CYPHER ζ', with the
probable origin and use of the said
EPISÈMON 73—82

CHAPTER VIII.

- Containing allusions to the ANCIENT nu-
merical use of the DI-GAMMA, as
connected with the subject of the
EPISÈMON ζ' 83—89

CHAPTER IX.

On the proper DISTINCTION to be OBSERVED BETWEEN the use of the THREE EPISÈMA, viz. <i>ἐπισημον</i> <i>Ταν</i> , <i>Κοππα</i> , and <i>Σανπι</i> , and the 24 LETTERS of the GREEK Alphabet, in the designation of NAMES and NUM- BERS ; together with some remarks on the necessity of retaining the EXACT NOTATION OF HOLY WRIT	90—100
--	--------

CHAPTER X.

TWO TABLES illustrative of Mr. FABER'S word APOSTATÈS, exhibiting its pal- pable inconsistency with the true Num- ber <i>χξς'</i> , or 666	101—107
---	---------

CHAPTER XI.

Examples proving the want of IDENTITY in the word APOSTATÈS, as applicable to any ONE PARTICULAR LAPSED CHURCH or PERSON EXCLUSIVELY	108—143
---	---------

CHAPTER XII.

Containing a REFUTATION of Dr. ADAM CLARKE'S hypothesis of <i>ἡ Λατινῇ βασιλεία</i> 'The LATIN KINGDOM'	144—158
---	---------

CHAPTER XIII.

- Remarks on the SPURIOUS Number $\chi\iota\varsigma'$,
or 616, which is mentioned by Professor
LEE 159—165

CHAPTER XIV.

- FIVE REASONS drawn from IRENÆUS, esta-
blishing the moral certainty of his or-
thography in the NAME $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, with
further remarks on the opinions of
Archbishop LAUD and Professor LEE . 166—178

CHAPTER XV.

- Observations on the DIPHTHONG, or the
BROAD, or CIRCUMFLEXED IOTA in the
Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, that
is, $\epsilon\iota$, or ϵ , or $\acute{\iota}$ 179—192

CHAPTER XVI.

- Of the authenticity and propriety of the
Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, as applied to the MAN,
whose NUMBER is $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, “666.” . 193—222

CHAPTER XVII.

- The general argument for the Name
 $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ as definitively and EXCLU-
SIVELY DESCRIPTIVE of “The MAN
of SIN,” further confirmed. 223—234

CHAPTER XVIII.

ROMANISM summarily CONFRONTED with HOLY SCRIPTURE	235—259
--	---------

CHAPTER XIX.

The subject recapitulated, with a brief notice of the various LATIN TITLES assumed by the PAPACY	260—273
--	---------

CHAPTER XX.

An historical account of the ELECTION, PROCLAMATION, and CORONATION of POPE INNOCENT XIII. (as recorded by Edward WRIGHT, Esq.) illustrating the GENIUS of POPERY	274—306
---	---------

- I. Table of Numerals.
- II. Scale of Combinations.

THE NAME AND NUMBER
OF THE BEAST.

LATEINOS.

“Τὸ ΟΝΟΜΑ τοῦ θηρίου”—“ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ
ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ Αὐτοῦ χξϛ’.”

“The NAME of the beast”—“IS THE NUMBER of a MAN; and
HIS NUMBER IS 666.”—Rev. xiii. 17, 18.

CHAPTER I.

THE SUBJECT PROPOSED.

SINCE the time of IRENÆUS, who was a contemporary with POLYCARP, the disciple of St. JOHN, the true investigation of the *secret name* but *given number* of THE MAN which the Apostle has propounded for our solution by the means of “*wisdom*” and “*understanding*,” has always been a subject deeply interesting, though perplexing, to the minds of the most learned and pious Commentators of *Divine Revelation*, as the numerous works extant on this particular point will clearly demonstrate. St. JOHN, however, says plainly¹—“*Here is wisdom. Let him that hath*

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

understanding COUNT THE NUMBER *of the beast*: for it is *the NUMBER of a MAN*; and HIS NUMBER is SIX HUNDRED THREE SCORE *and* SIX," or "666." Thus from the *Apostle's exhortation* "Let him that hath understanding," and his expression, ¹"Here is the mind which hath wisdom," (as well as from the examples of IRENÆUS, HIPPOLYTUS MARTYR, and others,) we know that a sober attempt to solve this *scriptural enigma* is perfectly justifiable. As "*the Number of a MAN*" must necessarily (according to the ancient mode of Greek calculations and of St. John's expression) imply *the NAME of a MAN*; the *Apostle* has made them *coincident*.²

Τὸ ΟΝΟΜΑ τῆς θηρίας ἢ τὸν ΑΡΙΘΜΟΝ τῆς ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ.
 'The NAME of the Beast, or THE NUMBER of HIS NAME:'—and *this NAME* and NUMBER of the *Beast* he declares to be "*the NUMBER of a MAN*."³
 ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ....ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ἐστίν. "It is *the NUMBER of a MAN*." καὶ ὁ ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ χξς'. "And HIS NUMBER" [or *the Number of Him*] "666." That is to say, "The Number of a Man," is, by a proper ellipsis, put for '*the Number of the Name of a Man*,' according to the opinion of Irenæus. Therefore, it will be absolutely necessary to abide by THIS APOSTOLIC RULE in the investigation of *the NAME of the MAN*, the *alphabetical LETTERS of which*, when taken *separately*, (according to *the mode of Greek computation*), must contain the *given arithmetical Number of the Beast* in the strictest possible manner, in order that a stop may be put to the multiplicity of vague

¹ Rev. xvii. 9.² Rev. xiii. 17.³ Ibid. 18.

speculations, which have gone forth into the world during the present age of *the Church*, through the fertile imaginations of various learned *writers on Prophecy*. And *such is my purpose*, with the firm hope of supplanting, by the means of scriptural truth, by sound argument, by classical and ancient Arithmetical Authorities, *all those Words, Names, Epithets, Titles and Sentences*, (excepting *Λατῆινος*) which have hitherto been produced in favour of the *Number 666*; but which are as *foreign* to the “*Wisdom*” and “*Understanding*” of which ST. JOHN speaks, as they are *orthographically, hypothetically, and otherwise incorrect*. For at the outset it is evident, not only from the words of ST. JOHN, that the characteristic ‘MARK’ . . . of the Beast must be the PROPER NAME of some “MAN,” (implied in HIS enigmatical Number, 666); but St. Paul also speaks in an especial manner of “*the MAN of SIN*”—“*the SON of PERDITION*,” to “*be revealed in his time.*”¹ . . .

ὁ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὁ ΥΙΟΣ τῆς ἀπωλείας; which *character* most fully portrayed the *Person of the POPE of ROME*. Thus as CHRIST is the *Name of a MAN*² (ὁ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ), so also similarly the *Appellative of his great Opponent* is that of a MAN, as we know from the masculine prefix of the definite Article³ ὁ ΑΝΤΙΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, and, therefore, if we can find the *proper name* of a MAN, which is answerable also in an *Appellative* sense, to the *descriptive MARK, NAME, and NUMBER* *χξς’*, or 666; as also *characteristic of*

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3. . . . ² “The Man Christ Jesus,” 1 Tim. ii. 5; Rom. v. 15.

³ 1 John ii. 22.

“ *the MAN of SIN* ”—“ *the SON of PERDITION* ; ” and κατ’ ἐξοχὴν, ‘ *the ANTICHRIST* ; ’ then, let us not doubt of *full success* : as we may be assumed to have the “ *Wisdom* ” and “ *Understanding* ” requisite for discovering as decisively as possible, the *secret name* of that *scriptural enigma*, which is brought to light in the *Proper Name* Λατῆινος, LATEINOS ; for it contains the *true NUMBER*, χξς’, or 666—is the *NAME* of a *MAN*, and exhibits the *indelible MARK* of the *Beast*, which is *LATIN*.

I. I purpose to commence this subject, or *Treatise*, by some critical Remarks on the opinion of the Rev. George Stanley Faber, relative to the Number χξς’, or 666, the enigmatical Name of which he imagines he has discovered, to a moral certainty, in the *Greek word* Αποστατης [APOSTATÈS,] as he writes.¹ ‘ I am much inclined to think, that, even independently of other objections, the very phraseology of the Apostle *shuts out every Name* which has been adduced as the Name of the Beast, *save ONLY the single Name APOSTATÈS.*’ But Mr. Faber knew well, at the very time he was recording this opinion for publication, that the *Word* (not ‘ *Name* ’) ΑPOSTATÈS, would, most clearly and unequivocally produce the *far greater* (and *much more legitimate*) *Number* 1160, which completely destroys the *certainty* of the *lesser Number* 666, the *former* being by 494 *above the Number mentioned by St. John* : and it is most evident that ΑPOSTATÈS cannot by any possible

¹ Faber’s Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. Chap. iv. Page 237.

means be converted into the *Proper Name* of a MAN. It is, moreover, monstrous to suppose that APOSTATÈS can be *limited* to contain the true Number 666, and also *extended* to the much greater Number 1160, at the same moment, and, therefore, the word APOSTATÈS lies open to a *twofold objection*.

1st. That APOSTATÈS is *not the PROPER NAME* of a MAN, but a *word* of the most indefinite signification, and therefore *cannot contain the Number of a MAN*, or be the *proper Appellative* of the Numbered Beast, because such a *word* might be rendered applicable to *every Apostate* or *Apostacy*.

2ndly. That APOSTATÈS *does produce* LETTER BY LETTER, the *true and undoubted Number* 1160, and is, therefore, plainly *irreducible* to the *far inferior Number* 666 ; because ‘ *things which are equal to the same, are equal to one another.*’ This word ΑΠΟΣΑΤΗΣ, therefore, must be *as remote from conclusiveness*, upon a *point so long the subject of Theological Controversy*, as the Number 1160 is, from the Number 666.

II. I intend to prove that the opinion of the learned Dr. Adam Clarke, who supposes that he has fully deciphered the *Proper Name* of the *numbered Beast*, or MAN, in the *words or sentence*, η Λατινη βασιλεια,¹ ‘THE LATIN KINGDOM ;’ (which *words or sentence*, by *computation* of the LETTERS of the *Greek Alphabet*, *Letter by Letter*, will produce the *exact number* χξς’, or 666 ; *but NOT the Proper Name of a MAN*,) must be rejected, as *NOT being answerable* to the “ *wisdom* ”

¹ Dr. Adam Clarke’s Commentary on Rev. xiii. 18.

and “ *understanding* ” of which St. JOHN speaks in reference to “ *the NAME of the Beast,* ” which “ *is the Number of a MAN.* ”

III. I shall then show that the theory of Professor Lee of Cambridge, who doubts the *correctness* of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666 ; because ¹ ‘ *In the times of IRENÆUS ANOTHER Number was found—616, or $\chi\iota\varsigma'$:* ’ is not supported by *earlier* or *better authority* than that of ARCHBISHOP LAUD, and the ² ‘ *Codices* ’ of ‘ PETAVIUS.’

It may be necessary to offer something in this place, by way of apology for troubling the Public with the revival of an old, and, what may appear to many, a worn out subject. But, as the three preceding Authors, some of the most recent writers of note in the present age, who have ventured to differ from IRENÆUS, in reference to the *orthography* of the NAME $\Lambda\alpha\rho\hat{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, as well as *the Number itself*, all of them differ in their opinions *from each other*, so they cannot ALL be correct, however learned and ingenious their separate systems may be. Consequently, until some ONE leading *Name of a MAN* be found, which can bid defiance to alteration, both in point of *orthography*, *number*, and *identity*, the *true solution* of the *enigmatical Number* and *Name of the Beast*, must remain *doubtful*, and liable, in some way or other, to *objection*, *alteration*, and *fresh speculations*. To establish a *specific Name of a MAN*, upon the

¹ Lee’s Dissertations on Prophecy, Diss. II. Sec. iii. Chap. xiii. Page 329.

² See Wetstein Notæ Criticæ, Canon xxiii. P. 36 and 37, appended to Greek Testament, Amsterdam, 1711.

surest and most conclusive Premises, is therefore my OBJECT and anxious desire in this little work; which object, I most firmly believe, I have ultimately attained, through much patient investigation of the subject, and the help of many classical and ancient Authorities, fairly admissible and conclusive on this point, as will appear in the sequel of this Treatise.

I must here be allowed to remark, that, with all due respect for Mr. Faber, I cannot comprehend how ‘*Homogeneity*,’ ‘*The System of Counter Elements*,’ ‘*The Doctrine of Chances*,’ the arbitrary substitution of certain words for others of opposite meanings, the reciprocal use of a Greek *επισημον*, or cypher, for a Greek *stenographical contraction*, or *Ligature of two distinct Letters*; assertions without proof, unfair quotations, and the parallelisms of texts, which, by comparison, are obviously different in their significations are allowable or necessary, in the elucidation of the *Names and Numbers* exhibited in the *Prophecies* of the *Holy Scriptures*. Yet *such* is the ingenious, or rather ambiguous and complex style which Mr. Faber has adopted in his endeavour to establish his favourite word APOSTATÈS, to the rejection of the *ancient and generally approved* NAME *Λατῆινος*, [LATEINOS] as used by Irenæus in the *second century*, which *Name*, when written in *Greek Letters*, is, I firmly believe, the *ONLY proper Name of a MAN*, that will (when used as an *Appellative*) satisfactorily exhibit the *Mark, Name, and Number of the Beast*. It not only identifies the *descriptive character of the ‘MAN,’* whose Number is 666, but

every individual Member of the LATIN Papal kingdom, each of whom may very properly be styled a Latin, inasmuch as every Papist is bound, in his allegiance to the Pope, to acknowledge the Divine and Canonical uses of the LATIN Language in the public service of the Roman Church ; notwithstanding its being a Dead, and (according to the words of St. Paul) “ an Unknown Tongue,” to the common people, and therefore antichristian, and to be denounced as an Anti-apostolical and Heretical practice.

CHAPTER II.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON MR. FABER'S HYPOTHESIS OF APOSTATÈS, WITH OBJECTIONS.

I SHALL now commence with the word *Αποστατης*, (APOSTATÈS,) or the hypothesis of the Rev. George Stanley Faber concerning the Number *χξς'*, or 666; to which end I shall proceed to consider the '*Four distinct Articles*, under which' (Mr. Faber informs us) 'the terms descriptive of the sacred enigma are set forth:' they are as follow—

'¹ The NAME of the Beast is a certain Mark, or Stigma or Character: which is figuratively said to be impressed upon him, which exhibits the component *Letters of his Name*, and by which he is emphatically distinguished.'

'The NAME of the Beast is the NAME of BLASPHEMY.'

'The NAME of the Beast COMPREHENDS the NUMBER of the Beast: and that NUMBER is declared to be 666.'

¹ Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. Ch. iv. P. 227.

‘ The NUMBER of the Beast, or the NUMBER 666 produced by the LETTERS of his NAME, is the NUMBER of a MAN.’

To the *first* and *third* of the foregoing ‘ Articles ’ I am not unwilling to give my assent ; but the *Second Article* affirms that ‘ *the NAME of the Beast is the NAME of BLASPHEMY ;* ’ and we are further instructed by Mr. Faber, that, ‘ BLASPHEMY denotes Apostacy,’ ¹ ‘ But even in the ordinary language of the Gospels,’ says he, ‘ no less than in the Prophetic language of the Apocalypse, BLASPHEMY denotes APOSTACY. The NAME, therefore, of Blasphemy is the NAME of APOSTACY : ’ ‘ Accordingly, Apostacy is the *appellation* prophetically bestowed upon it by ST. PAUL.’ ‘ The Name, then, of the Beast, being the Name of Blasphemy or Apostacy, must be a Name descriptive of the Apostatic worship foretold by St. Paul.’ ² ‘ Hence we may conclude, that the Name of the Beast, or the Name expressive of Blasphemy, must be some such *Greek* word as is equivalent in *English* to THE BLASPHEMER or THE APOSTATE.’ ³ ‘ Now there are *two* Greek words, which bear the requisite signification, BLASPHEMUS and APOSTATÈS. [βλασφημος and Αποστατης.] But merely to bear the requisite signification is not alone sufficient. To determine the point, whether *either* of these *two* words be the intended Blasphemous Name of the Beast, we must resort to what the Prophet remarkably

¹ Faber’s Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. ch. iv. p. 231, 233, 234, 239, 240.

² Ibid 233.

³ Ibid 234.

calls the *wisdom* of calculating or of summing up their respective arithmetical *Letters*.'

'With respect to the word BLASPHEMUS, when *mechanically* subjected to *this process*, for it admits not of any particular *wisdom* in calculating, it brings out the *Number* 1051. Hence it must be rejected: because, though it answers to the *test* exhibited in the *Second Article*, it is found incapable of answering to the *test* exhibited in the *Third Article*.'

'But the word APOSTATES, when (as the Prophet speaks) *wisely* and not *superficially* subjected to the same arithmetical process: that is to say, when calculated, as written *contractedly* in its less obvious Greek form, and not as written *uncontractedly* in its more obvious Greek form, brings out the precise Number 666.'

And Mr. Faber winds up his Argument by saying—

¹ 'The *Number* of the Beast is the *Number* of the Beast's *Name*: whence, analogously, the *Number* of a MAN is the *Number* of the intended MAN's *Name*. But the *Number* of the Beast's *Name* is 666: and this same *Number* 666 is declared to be also the *Number* of a MAN. Therefore the *Number* 666, which is comprehended in the *Name* of the Beast, is also comprehended in the *Name* of the *particular* MAN to whom the Prophet alludes. Now the *Name* of the Beast, being *the Name of Blasphemy*, is *not* a *Proper Name*, but a *Descriptive Name*. Therefore, analogously, the *Name* of the MAN must be a *De-*

¹ Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, vol. iii. p. 239, 240.

scriptive Name, exhibiting his *Character*, not a *Proper Name* specifying his *Personal Individuality*.

‘ Such being the joint nature both of the *Beast’s Name* and of the *MAN’S NAME*, it is evident that the descriptive *Name* of the *one* must be identical with the descriptive *Name* of the *other* : at least, on what is called the *DOCTRINE OF CHANCES*, the *PRESUMPTION* is so strong as to *AMOUNT TO A MORAL CERTAINTY*. The *NAME*, therefore, of *THE MAN*, like the *Name* of the *Beast*, IS *APOSTATÈS* : ’ &c.

It is highly favourable to my opinions that Mr. Faber has drawn the *conclusion* of his Argument from ‘ *THE DOCTRINE OF CHANCES*, ’ and I think, by a candid examination of the subject, it must appear that the *premises* are of the *same nature*, according to *such presumptive Mode of Reasoning* as that exhibited in the foregoing words ; for, the *truth* of such an unqualified Assertion as that which is set forth in Mr. Faber’s *Second Article*, viz. That ‘ *the Name of the Beast* is the *Name of Blasphemy* : ’ and elsewhere, that ‘ *BLASPHEMY* denotes *APOSTACY* ’—is ‘ *PRESUMPTION* ’ enough ; because it must depend upon the *PROOF* of *Three Things*, whether or not *such* an Argument ‘ *amount to a Moral Certainty*. ’

1st. Whether ‘ *BLASPHEMY* denotes *APOSTACY*. ’

2ndly. Whether *BLASPHEMY* OR *APOSTACY* are *either* of them the ‘ *Descriptive Name* ’ of the Numbered Beast or *MAN*, even if it CAN be proved that the latter word *Αποστατης*, in its *contracted form*, contains the true Number 666, which is *most doubtful*.

If it be allowed for the sake of argument, that *Ἀποστατης* 'when written *contractedly*, in its *less obvious Greek form*,' is equal to 666, yet when written '*uncontractedly*' (*Ἀποστατης*) 'in its *more obvious Greek form*,' it is *invariably* equal to 1160; therefore, the *same word* is both *equal to the Number 666 and the Number 1160*: which is preposterous, because it is contrary to sound reasoning and *orthography*, and more than Mr. Faber would admit, in reference to the NAME *Λατῆινος*; or *any other Name*, or *word*, at *variance with his own hypothesis*. Moreover, it is evident that if the word '*Blasphemy*' can be proved to '*denote Apostacy*,' still *Apostacy cannot be proved to denote the NAME OF A MAN*, and the *Number* would be of *no possible use*, unless the *Name of the MAN* were first found, for even according to Mr. Faber's *fourth Article*, the *Number* must be elicited by the *individual 'Letters of the Name.'* 'The *Number of the Beast*, or the *Number 666 produced by the LETTERS of HIS NAME*, is the *Number of a MAN.*'

3rdly. Whether it be legitimate to use the Greek stenographical *contraction of sigma and tau* ς or $\sigma\tau$, and the stenographical *episèmon*, or cypher, ς' or ς , called by Greek Grammarians *ἐπισήμων* $\tau\alpha\upsilon$, in the same manner; for the *contraction* ς is *never used to denote Numbers of any kind*, and its *equivalent LETTERS* (ς and τ) *are equal to 500*; but the *episèmon* ς' is only used as a *stenographical cypher to denote the Number 6*, without any necessary reference to the *LETTERS of the Greek*

Alphabet. [See the Tables at the end of this Work.]

It is manifest enough that EACH of the THREE foregoing points is *extremely doubtful*; so much so, that they may ALL be *fairly* and *legitimately disputed*; and yet the whole force and strength of Mr. Faber's argument hangs upon their separate and conjoint validity: and why, therefore, should the ancient and correct *orthography* of Irenæus concerning the *Diphthong* δ or ϵ be impugned or discarded for such novelty and uncertainty as that which Mr. Faber has proffered to us as a substitute for $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\varsigma$?

From Mr. Faber's *fourth Article* it appears that he has literally *refuted his own Argument*; for he says, 'The Number of the Beast, or the *Number 666 produced* by the LETTERS of HIS NAME, is also the NUMBER of a MAN.' Now it would not be suspected from Mr. Faber's *fourth Article*, that *he did not intend to adhere strictly to the individual LETTERS* of the *Greek Alphabet*, but it is a FACT that the whole force of his argument depends upon an *uncertainty*, that is, whether it be legitimate to use an $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$, or *cypher*, in the place or room of *two distinct letters*, viz. the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Gamma\alpha\nu$, or cypher ς' or ς , in the same manner as the Greek *contraction* ς or $\sigma\tau$; and until this point is cleared up in the most satisfactory manner possible, his whole argument is literally good for nothing, because it wants *proof*, which is "the one thing needful" in the case. Who then is to be the *Umpire* to *decide* whether or not we must be *compelled*, in obedience to Mr. Faber's *ipse dixit*,

to use the word *Αποστατης*, according to *the strictest rules of ORTHOGRAPHY*, ALWAYS in its CONTRACTED FORM, when calculating the NUMBER OF THIS WORD? If the contraction *ς* and the *episèmon s'* are proved to be *synonymous in terms and equivalent in value*, in reference to the Number 6, THEN the said word APOSTATÈS in its contracted form is equal to 666: but the word *Αποστατης* in its UNCONTRACTED FORM is without any condition, restriction, or limitation, universally equal to the Number 1160, which is 494 above the given number of the Beast. [See Table on *Αποστατης*, Chapter X.] If it can be proved that the *orthography* of Irenæus is *incorrect*, (which I think impossible, see Chapter XV. concerning the *Diphthong ει* or *ϝ*) still his MODE of eliciting the number is by taking the *individual Greek LETTERS of the NAME*, as they appear in the Greek alphabet, *separately*, and NOT *contractedly*, leaving the three *επισημα*, or *cyphers*, and all *stenographical contractions* or *Ligatures* of letters in their respective places: and *if* we are to *decide the merits of the question* by the *EXAMPLES* of Irenæus, Hippolytus Martyr, Aretas, &c. which are supported by Mede, Dr. Henry More, Bishop Newton, Dr. Adam Clarke, and all the learned commentators, THEN *Mr. Faber's hypothesis must, of necessity, fall to the ground.*

It appears to me that Mr. Faber's scheme is *objectionable* in the following particulars, which will be more clearly seen by referring to his '*Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*,' [Vol. iii. from page 225 to page 242] as compared with the following remarks.

Objection I. That as APOSTATÈS is *not the Name of a MAN*, therefore, it cannot contain the NUMBER of a MAN, and, consequently, cannot be the *Appellative* of the Numbered Beast; and this is corroborated by Mr. Faber's own words, viz. That 'The Number of the Beast is the Number of the Beast's Name; whence, analogously, the *Number of a MAN* is the intended MAN'S NAME. But the Number of the Beast's Name is 666; and this same Number 666 is declared to be also the Number of a Man. Therefore the Number 666, which is comprehended in the Name of the Beast, is also comprehended in the NAME of the PARTICULAR MAN to whom the Prophet alludes.' But how can *Apostatès* be proved to be 'the NAME of the particular MAN to whom the Prophet alludes,' if *no MAN* ever bore *such a particular NAME*? What *analogy* can there be between the NAME and NUMBER of a MAN, where no *proper* or *definite* NAME is given of him whereby his *Identity* and '*Descriptive Character*' may be discovered? An ANONYMOUS or *nameless* MAN is therefore the *character* portrayed by Mr. Faber, which is absurd.

Objection II. That Mr. Faber has asserted in his *second Article* that '*The Name of the Beast is the Name of Blasphemy.*' [Page 229.] But the Apostle John merely says that "upon his" seven "heads" were the Names or "*Name of Blasphemy,*" Rev. xiii. 1. Besides which βλασφημος neither contains the Number of the Beast, nor is it the *Name* of a MAN; and if it be true, as Mr. Faber asserts, that, '*The Name of the Beast is the Name of BLASPHEMY,*'

consequently the *Greek word* BLASPHEMOS must contain the Number 666 of the Beast: but it has already been acknowledged by Mr. Faber [Page 234], that ‘βλασφημος brings out the Number 1051. Hence it must be rejected; because though it answers to the test exhibited in the *second Article*, it is found *incapable of answering to the test* exhibited in the *third Article*.’

Objection III. That the word βλασφημος is made ‘homogeneous’ with Αποστατης, without any sufficient *scriptural or other authorities*, beyond the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Faber, who declares that ‘*Blasphemy denotes Apostacy*,’ although it is certain that a Man may be a *blasphemous character* without *Apostatizing from the faith of Christ*; for no man can be said to be an *Apostate from the Faith*, who never embraced it; neither can a Man be an *Apostate from Judaism, Romanism, Mohammedanism*, or any thing else which he never professed to believe; and although *Pagan Imperial Rome*, (which is represented by the *first secular or Blasphemous Roman Beast*,) persecuted the *Apostles and primitive Christians* to death, during the three first centuries of the *Christian Æra*, yet *is she not chargeable with Apostacy*, but only *Idolatry, Persecution, and Blasphemy*.

Objection IV. That if ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ be admitted as the ‘homogeneous’ substitute of BLASPHEMOS, still the *former word* cannot, either in its *contracted or uncontracted form*, produce the Number 666, because of a necessary *numerical HIATUS* occasioned by the *spurious introduction of the* επισημον or cypher ς’ for

the Number 6, among the LETTERS of the word APOSTATÈS, but which is not the Stenographical Ligature or Contraction of *sigma* and *tau*, ς or $\sigma\tau$, but merely a *cypher* :—And, because of a REDUNDANCY of *Numbers* occasioned by the *uncontracted* numerical use of the two *separate* LETTERS, *sigma* and *tau*, which are *unitedly* equal to 500, instead of 6. [See my Table on *Apostatès*, Chapter X. as also the Table of the 24 Greek Letters, with the 3 $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$ at the end.]

Objection V. That the word APOSTATÈS is an *epithet* or *title* far too *general* and *indefinite* to answer the purpose intended by the “*wisdom*” and “*understanding*” of which St. John speaks, in reference to the NAME of the Beast, which *unless it be the* PROPER NAME of a MAN, and applicable in every other respect to the *character of the Beast*, cannot be the Proper (or Appellative) Name of the Beast, whose specific Number in Greek numerals is 666, or $\chi\xi\varsigma'$.

Objection VI. That in calculating the LETTERS in the word Αποστατης , by the *mystical* ‘*calculative*’ use of the Greek stenographical *contraction* ς (which is *equivalent to two distinct Letters*, viz. *sigma* and *tau*,) as if it were *synonymous* with the Greek $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *cypher* ς' , and *equal to 6*, contrary to the custom of every Greek writer extant, and the example of Irenæus, which was to calculate the LETTERS of the NAME of the MAN, or *Beast*, Letter by Letter, according to the *established custom of the Greeks*, Mr. Faber has departed from the *plainest rules of Grecian orthography*, and numerical calculations.

Objection VII. That if it be legitimate to use the contraction ς as the representative of the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ Fav , or cypher ς' (of which practice we have no example on record) *much more is it legitimate* to use the *sigma* and *tau*, UNCONTRACTEDLY, according to the universal custom of the ancient Greeks, when calculating the *Names of Men, cities, or words* of any kind, after the manner of Irenæus, Hippolytus Martyr, Aretas, &c. [See Dr. Adam Clarke's observations, in his Commentary, relative to the Mode of Calculating the Greek numerals, Revelations xiii. ; also Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon ; Lamy's Apparatus Biblicus, Book II. Chap. v. Page 311. See also the Tables at the end of this work, and the authorities quoted in my Preface in answer to Dean Woodhouse.]

Objection VIII. That the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ Fav , or stenographical cypher ς' , is not only made the representative of the Greek contraction ς or $\sigma\tau$, in calculating the Number 6, without any classical or grammatical authority for such supposed 'homogeneity ;' but, moreover, the *little Mark* (') *over the* $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ (ς') is prudently omitted ; which mark clearly 'denotes' it to be a cypher, and *not* the Greek contraction of *sigma* and *tau* : for when the mark is above the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$, then it denotes *six*—as $\varsigma' = 6$; but when the said mark is below the *episemon*, then it denotes *six thousand*, as $\varsigma = 6,000$: Mr. Faber has therefore been guilty of a very serious omission.

Objection IX. That the two numerical *episemons*, (or $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$), which by Grammarians are called Κοππα and Σανπι, the characteristics of which are S or $\text{ζ}'$;

and ϑ', are by Mr. Faber termed, ¹ 'two CONVENTIONAL MARKS,' which is no proof of the *integrity* or *fidelity* of his *orthography*; and even when the *Names of these two episèmons* are given him by grammarians, he prefers *inventing other terms* to explain them. However, if the terms 'two CONVENTIONAL MARKS' may with propriety be applied to the *two episèmons* Κοππα and Σανπι, it follows as a consequence, that, as the επισημον Ταυ, or ς', is equally distinguished by its *given* appellation, so the *latter* is also a THIRD 'CONVENTIONAL MARK,' and, therefore, according to Mr. Faber's own opinion it is *no Letter*, nor the contraction of *sigma* and *tau*. But it is well known that these *three characters*, or *cyphers*, viz. επισημον Ταυ....Κοππα.... and Σανπι, have been severally introduced among the 24 *letters* of the Greek Alphabet to make up *units*, *tens*, and *hundreds*, and not as *ligatures* of certain distinct letters. [See Table of the 24 Greek Letters, with the three επισημά, considered arithmetically at the end.]

Objection X. That the fatal consequence of admitting Mr. Faber's opinion to be correct, in rendering 'homogeneous' the *episèmon* ς' and *contraction* ς will be that we shall have the *new style* of making 6 equal to 500, and 666 equal to 1160, which is well worthy of what Mr. Faber terms, 'The wisdom of calculating,' 'wisdom in computation,' 'calculative wisdom,' &c. &c. [See Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Pages 234, 235, 237.]

Objection XI. That Mr. Faber has *not proved* that

¹ Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. chap. iv. p. 236.

the Greeks did anciently use the contraction of *sigma* and *tau*, ς , with which to express the Number 6. Nor has he on any ONE occasion, throughout his TWO publications on the word $\Lambda\tau\omicron\varsigma\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$, used the term $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$, or $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Gamma\alpha\upsilon$, concerning the character or cypher ς' or ς , upon which so much is built, that the 'Sacred Calendar of Prophecy' has been thought worthy to supersede another work, which he had formerly published, in two volumes, on the '1260 Days of Years;' and now he has added a third to establish the second, which is entitled 'Recapitulated Apostacy.'

Objection XII. That the *epsilon* (ϵ) in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, is rejected by Mr. Faber, upon the authority of *Lycophron*, and his commentator *Tzetztes*, as Mr. Faber says:

¹ 'As for the word *LATINUS*, it cannot be the name of the Beast; for, in the first place, it is not a descriptive name of blasphemy; and, in the second place, it does not contain the fated number 666. That number can only be elicited from it, by writing it with the broad $\epsilon\iota$, $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$. But I much incline to believe, that no instance can be found, in which it is ever thus expressed by a Greek writer. The form employed, is, I believe, uniformly $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$. If *Lycophron* writes $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, his commentator, *Tzetztes*, subjoins $\acute{\alpha}\pi\delta$ $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu$. *Lycoph. Alex.* 1254.'

My objections to the above mode of reasoning are as follows:—

1st. Mr. Faber calls the proper Name *LATINUS*, 'the word *Latinus*;' but because *Latinus* is the

¹ Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. chap. iv. p. 237, and 238.

Proper Name of a Man, (and not simply ‘ a word,’) therefore it CAN be the *Name of the Beast*, inasmuch as St. John informs us that “ the NAME of the beast . . . is the *number* of a MAN.”¹ And this is corroborated by the *testimony* of Irenæus, who has made use of the name LATEINOS, and two other proper names.

2nd. Mr. Faber tells us that LATINUS cannot be the name of the Beast, *because ‘ it is not a descriptive name of Blasphemy ;’* but as BLASPHEMY is not a proper name of a MAN, so it cannot be the proper name of the Beast ; besides which Mr. Faber has confessed that βλασφημος does NOT contain the number 666, but the number 1051.

3dly. Mr. Faber informs us that LATINUS cannot be the name of the Beast, *because ‘ it does not contain the fated number 666 ;’* but in this Mr. Faber is also much mistaken, (as will hereafter appear,) for a *circumflexed iota* (ι) is generally, if not always, equivalent to a *diphthong* or broad ε or ϛ ; and as old ENNIUS, who lived before the Christian Æra, wrote the name LATINUS by ‘ *Popolei tenuere LA-TEINEI,*’ so his authority (though LATIN) is tantamount to certainty, and justifies the orthography of Irenæus. As Mr. Faber had previously written on the number 666, in favour of the name LATEINOS, in his work entitled ‘ *The Great Period of 1260 Years,*’ Vol. II. from Page 330 to 335 ; he must have known that Dr. Henry More and Bishop Newton had already quoted old ENNIUS, and other

¹ ‘ Numerus Hominis ’ being put for ‘ Numerus [Nominis] Hominis.’

writers, in favour of the use of the *diphthong* or *broad* $\epsilon\iota$ or ϕ , as used by Irenæus. However, many more authorities will be hereafter produced, to establish the *diphthong* beyond all possibility of *future* controversy. Moreover, the *iota* in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is written by Mr. Faber with an *acute accent*, as ($\acute{\iota}$), instead of a *circumflex accent*, as ($\tilde{\iota}$), which is contrary to all Greek precedent; because the *iota* in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is, by all ancient Greek authors, written with a *circumflex accent*; and a circumflex accent, over a vowel, generally, if not always, indicates the contraction of a diphthong, as ϕ , $\epsilon\iota$, or $\tilde{\iota}$. Eusebius writes the name of Irenæus, by beginning it with the Diphthong $\epsilon\iota$, Εἰρηναῖος .

Objection XIII. In wrongly quoting Irenæus, concerning the name Τῆταν , by writing it Τῆταν , and so leaving out both the *epsilon* (ϵ) and *circumflex accent* (\sim), and substituting an *acute accent*, as ($\acute{\iota}$) which denotes an *incorrect*, or at least a *careless mode of quotation*, on the part of Mr. Faber: which is scarcely excusable in writing *polemically* on a NAME and NUMBER which have been so much and so long the subject of interminable speculations.

CHAPTER III.

OBJECTIONS TO MR. FABER'S HYPOTHESIS CONTINUED,
WITH OBSERVATIONS ON THE EPISEMON ς' AND
THE CONTRACTION ς .

EVEN if the ancient use of the diphthong or broad ϵ , or ϵ , instead of the *iota circumflexed*, as ($\tilde{\iota}$) in the name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\tilde{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, be considered sufficient, on the ground of modern orthography to set aside the legitimate establishment of that proper name of a Man, for the number 666; what critic would not object to the manifold inaccuracies of Mr. Faber, in reference to the word APOSTATÈS, &c. &c. as stated in the *thirteen preceding Objections*? With every wish to allow all due merit to the observations of Mr. Faber, I cannot for a moment suppose that Irenæus, who professedly wrote '*against all Heresies*,' ('*contra omnes Hæreses*,') would have deliberately made choice of *two names* out of three, viz. TEITAN and LATEINOS, each of which contains the *diphthong* or *broad* ϵ or ϵ , if *such orthography* were inadmissible in his day,

or earlier, either among the *ancient* GREEKS or ROMANS, and, therefore, I must conclude that, as that Greek and Christian Father has made no apology for the two-fold use of the *diphthong* or *broad* *ει*, that *his orthography is correct* in these two Names; and that Dr. Henry More, Bishop Newton, and others, have judiciously followed his example, and quoted Ennius as an authority for such usage. It is my intention to bring forward, in my remarks upon the name *Αατεινος*, a multiplicity of proofs, both Greek and Latin, in favour of the *ancient use of the diphthong* *ει* or *ει*; seeing beforehand how impossible it is to retain the word APOSTATES under any circumstances, the noun being too general with regard to identity — the orthography being spurious, and utterly inapplicable as the name of any Man; and thus wholly at variance with the words of St. John. In the only legitimate manner of calculating it as a word (for name it is not), the number produced by its individual Greek letters will amount to 1160, instead of the number 666.

Although Mr. Faber says that, ¹ ‘even in the ordinary language of the Gospels, no less than in the prophetic language of the Apocalypse, *Blasphemy* denotes *Apostacy*: and consequently the name of Apostacy describes the peculiar nature of the Beast’s religion:’ yet is it abundantly evident, even if it can be proved that ‘*Blasphemy* denotes *Apostacy*,’ that, still

¹ Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. chap. iv. p. 231.

neither *Blasphemy* nor *Apostacy* denotes the name of a MAN, and, consequently they must be rejected, according to the words of the Apostle John, who says that, “ the NAME of the Beast ” is “ the NUMBER of a MAN.” Hence it is apparent that IRENÆUS has followed the *literal words* of the Apostle, by the use of three proper names, viz. Lateinos, Teitan, and Euanthas : while the utmost that can be said of such words as βλασφημος and Αποστατης is, that they are Titles or Epithets of opprobrium, and not names of men ; for where do we read of a Pagan, Jew, Mohammedan, Christian, Roman Catholic, &c. whose name was either Apostatès or Blasphèmos ? How then can either of them ‘ denote ’ the Proper name of any ‘ particular man ’ ? And without the Name, ‘ the number of the man ’ (which is declared to be 666), cannot be properly ascertained ; for ‘ the number of a man ’ must necessarily *imply his name*, or he would be *an anonymous*, or *nameless* character, and the absurdity of supposing that there ever was a man of celebrity in the world *without a name* is too palpable to need a remark. St. John, therefore, consistently with the “ wisdom ” and “ understanding ” of which he speaks, makes the name of the man, or number of his name, synonymous ; because, the name of the Beast is evidently the *proper* and *appellative name* of some particular man, whose name is identical with the given number 666, or χξς’. Even the Papists of the traitorous *Seminary at Rheims*, have consented that the name of ANTICHRIST shall be that of ONE *special*

MAN, and of a *peculiar name*, after the following manner. They thus expound.

¹ Rev. xiii. 18. "It is the number of a Man." 'A MAN he must be, and not a *Devil* or *Spirit*, as here it is clear, and by St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii., where he is called "the MAN of Sin," (and in the same paragraph, the Rheimists say,) 'ANTICHRIST, who by his description here, and in the said epistle to the Thessalonians, must be ONE *special* MAN, and of a PARTICULAR PROPER NAME, as our LORD JESUS IS.'

To whichever of the ²two Beasts the MARK, NAME, and NUMBER belong, it must be noted that neither βλασφημος nor Αποστατης is an appropriate word; for neither of them contains the alphabetical number 666, much less does either of these words import that *species* of 'homogeneity' which can make it appropriate to the name of a MAN, a point that calls for the exercise of that "wisdom" and "understanding" in regard to the discovery of the enigmatical NAME of which the Apostle speaks. Hence, however exact the arithmetical number in Αποστατης may seem to be for 666, (supposing withal that the επισημον or cypher ς' and the contraction ς, may be reciprocally used for the number 6,) still it is evident that even then it cannot prove the point at issue, and, therefore, must be rejected. Even should it be admitted, for argument's sake, that 'Blasphemy denotes Apostacy,' and that APOSTATÈS con-

¹ Dr. Fulke's Annotations on the New Testament. Rhem. 9. Rev. xiii. 18.

² Rev. xiii. 1, 11.

tains the true number ‘ 666 ; ’ it would not follow as a consequence that Apostatès denotes the Name of a Man, and if not the Name, the Number itself can be of no avail, for the *number* must *imply the name* also ; for if it would, then it must follow, as cause and effect, that *every Greek word*, when ‘ *subjected* ’ to some ‘ *mechanical* ’ or fabricated arithmetical ‘ *process* ’ similar to that which Mr. Faber has *acknowledged* and *adopted*, must produce the number 666, and become ‘ *descriptive* ’ of the MARK, NAME, and CHARACTER of the *numbered Beast*. This, however, would be to admit a *degree of latitude* which St. John has not allowed us ; for the Apostle has *restricted* “ the NAME of the Beast ” to “ the NUMBER of a MAN,” which is declared to be “ 666,” and this is the *ne plus ultra* of the matter. Therefore, whenever the imagination of any one would wander from this *particular* “ wisdom ” and “ understanding,” it is highly justifiable to call such an one to order for a palpable digression and of such a deviation Mr. Faber is certainly proved guilty. I have already noticed that by Mr. Faber’s 4th Article, &c. he has literally refuted his own hypothesis by the unsoundness of his premises which are utterly untenable, because *inconclusive*.

In opposition, therefore, to Mr. Faber’s opinion, I affirm, in unison with the *words of St. John* and the *example* of Irenæus, that it is the NUMBER and NAME of a MAN for which we must seek, and not an indefinite Epithet or Title of Opprobrium, such as APOSTATÈS, which is far *too general* a characteristic

to be admitted as canonical, even by the *Rheimish College of Jesuits*, who would soon *retort* the charge and *character* of *Apostatès* upon ALL *National Churches* not in strict communion with their own *Mother ROME*; of which *Bellarmino*, *Baronius*, *Arnoux*, and others have given us special proofs. Even *Bishop Bossuet* has not been unmindful of the *supposed* value of this word *APOSTATÈS* in its ‘*contracted form*,’ for he had used the *contraction* ¹ς as if it were the *επισημον* or cypher *ς*, in a similar manner with Mr. Faber and Archdeacon Wrangham, long before it made its unintelligible appearance in the ‘*Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*.’ But the number ‘666,’ or *χξς*, must decidedly be elicited from some *Proper* and *Appellative Name* (i. e. of ONE common to MANY MEN of the SAME ORDER and degree, such as the PAPAL SUCCESSION,) which is both the NAME of a MAN, and will contain the number 666; for the Apostle says—*Ὡδὲ ἡ ΣΟΦΙΑ ἐστίν· ὁ ἔχων ΝΟΤΩ ψηφισάτω τὸν ΑΡΙΘΜΟΝ τοῦ Θηρίου· ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ γὰρ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ Αριθμὸς ΑΥΤΟΥ χξς*. “*Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the Beast: for it is the NUMBER of a MAN, and his number is six HUNDRED THREE SCORE AND SIX.*” Unless then the *proper NAME* of the *Beast*, will, by the *individual LETTERS* of HIS NAME, produce the exact number 666, and afterwards become the *proper APPELLATIVE*

¹ See also a work published at Lyons, in 1817, entitled, ‘*Les Précurseur de l’Antichrist*.’

of some certain *ecclesiastical* MAN, whose character in a *descriptive* sense fully corresponds with that of the Beast, there can be no real *identity* between *his number* and *his name*, which is absolutely necessary according to the words of St. John. But if in the NAME ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ we can find the *only Appellative* of a MAN, which can with strict propriety be applied to a professed *Ecclesiastical Man*, we shall have attained our object; for there must be an entire correspondence between the Mark, Name, and Number of the Beast, or why should the Apostle John have mentioned them conjointly? ¹ “*The MARK, or the NAME of the Beast, or the NUMBER of HIS NAME*” “*IS the NUMBER of a MAN; and HIS NUMBER is six hundred threescore and six.*”

Now in the *Succession* of POPES we have an *ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of the *Highest Possible Degree*, a self-exalted MAN, the very LATIN MAN, who vaunteth himself to be the ‘PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,’ and who ² “*SITTETH in the TEMPLE OF GOD,*” at ROME, even ³ “*the MAN of Sin,*” “*the SON of Perdition,*” who is also *seated* on the ⁴ “*SEVEN MOUNTAINS*” of ROME, and whose temporal and ecclesiastical ‘*Imperium in Imperio*’ has been *coeval* with the *predicted* “*1260 Days*” of Years (commencing with A. D. 533, and ending A. D. 1792), i. e. ⁵ “*a thousand two hundred and threescore days*” or “*a Time, and Times, and half a Time;*” or,

¹ Rev. xiii. 17, 18.

² 2 Thess. ii. 4.

³ 2 Thess. ii. 3.

⁴ Rev. xvii. 9.

⁵ Rev. xii. 6, 14. and xiii. 5. compared with Ezek. iv. 6.

“forty and two months.” The character of the Pope also is in the highest sense applicable to the *predicted*¹ ἡ Αποστασία of St. Paul, though APOSTATÈS is neither his figuratively impressed NAME, nor does it contain his enigmatical Number 666, for he is a LATIN *Antichristian*, *Autocratical* and *Theocratical* MAN,² “whose coming is after the *working of Satan* with ALL *power* and *signs* and *lying wonders*, and with ALL *deceivableness of unrighteousness*,” even HE who hath³ “TWO HORNS like a LAMB, and SPAKE as a DRAGON.”

Furthermore, I would contend although Mr. Faber has asserted that, ‘even in the *ordinary language of the Gospels*, no less than in the *prophetic language of the Apocalypse*, BLASPHEMY denotes APOSTACY,’ that he is perfectly unauthorized in employing the word APOSTATÈS as the *substitute* or *representative* of BLASPHEMOS, because he has given us no substantial parallel passages from the Holy Scriptures (to which he would appear, in terms both general and particular, to⁴ refer his Readers), nor from Dictionaries of acknowledged authority, to prove that *these two words* are ‘*homogeneous*’ or *synonymous in signification*. Confessedly, however, very much depends upon the propriety of such *arbitrary usage*; for if no *limits* were assigned to the *real and specific meanings of words and names*, there would soon be an END to their *established usage*

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3.

² 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10. ³ Rev. xiii. 11.

⁴ Faber’s Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. chap. iv. p. 231, and Vol. i. Book I. chap. i. p. 17.

altogether ; and an *inappropriate signification* should be a *sufficient reason* for the *rejection* of *any* WORD or NAME, without *contending about its orthography* in respect of ‘ *calculative wisdom*,’ (an expression which Mr. Faber has adopted in this difficult case), or, indeed, *any other wisdom*. In my humble opinion, there is no more reason for the *commutation* of the word βλασφημος for Αποστατης, or the *conversion* of *sigma* and *tau* into the CONTRACTION ς (which is subsequently identified with the *stenographical* επισημον or *cypher s’*,) than there would be for the production of *any other Greek word* framed with the *aforesaid Greek contraction*, which although it might contain the precise number 666, would nevertheless be fatally distant from the NAME of *the* MAN. Mr. Faber’s argument, therefore, savours more of *ingenuity* than *grammatical correctness*, or of *sound reasoning*.

It is manifest enough that although Mr. Faber has asserted that ‘ *Blasphemy denotes Apostacy*,’ and has deliberately substituted the one word for the other, viz. Αποστατης for βλασφημος—but by what metamorphosing Rule I must leave him to explain, and finally *adopted* APOSTATÈS as a *word* more suited to his own taste, (for *Blasphèmos* he *necessarily* acknowledges will *not produce the Number 666* of the Beast), he immediately rejects as *insufficient* the *ancient* and *generally approved* NAME Λατῆινος, as used by IRENÆUS, on account of a *supposed orthographical error*, that is, upon the *surmise* that the (ε) in Λατῆινος is *redundant* ; although it will be

proved hereafter by many *classical* and *ancient* examples, that it is *not redundant*; and although Mr. Faber has brought forward ‘*Lycophron* and *his commentator Tzetzes*’ in support of such rejection, and thereby silenced, as he supposes, the authority of Irenæus, as a *bad grammarian*, he begins *de novo* by instituting a specimen of incomparable orthography, namely, by endeavouring to establish the promiscuous use of the *sigma* and *tau*, *contractedly*, (ς , or $\sigma\tau$,) with the CYPHER OR CHARACTER F , or ς' , called by grammarians $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu \text{Fav}$, or *episèmon* ς' ; whereas the LETTERS of the Greek stenographical *contraction* ς , if taken *separately* in calculating numbers, (which is the only legitimate *method* of using them,) are equal to 500, because *sigma* (σ) is equal to 200, and *tau* (τ) is equal to 300; but the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu \text{Fav}$, or CYPHER ς' , is only equal to 6; and the difference between 500 and 6 is obvious enough—because ‘*the whole is greater than its part*:’ but how can an $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *stenographical* CYPHER, which is *numerically equal* to 6, possibly rank with, be equal to, or used for TWO *distinct* LETTERS of the *Greek alphabet*, which are *equal* to 500? Yet this is the conclusion to which we must come, if we admit Mr. Faber’s statement.

¹ ‘I cannot,’ (says Mr. Faber) ‘refrain from noticing the *very singular manner* in which the *contraction* OR *cypher* ς came to be employed for the purpose of expressing the Number 6.’

¹ Faber’s Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. ch. iv. p. 238.

Thus while he most carefully *avoids all mention* of the TERM *επισημον*, or *επισημον Tav*, the distinguishing appellation of the Greek stenographical *cypher* *ς'*, which is *no contraction* at all, but upon which the whole of his hypothesis is built ; he classes the Greek *contraction* of *sigma* and *tau* (*ς*) with the stenographical *επισημον*, or *cypher* *ς'*, as if they were one and the same character. However, he admits that the character in question, which represents the number 6, is a ' CYPHER ; ' but if it be a *cypher* or *επισημον*, it is *no LETTER*, nor a contraction of LETTERS : for a regular Greek *contraction* or *ligature* is an abbreviated or stenographical form of writing *two or more letters*. Mr. Faber has very prudently abstained from advancing a single example of this ' *very singular manner*' of employing the ' *contraction or cypher*' *ς*, ' *for the purpose of expressing the number 6 ;*' neither can he prove that *SUCH orthography* was admissible in *ancient times among the Greeks* : for this *episèmon* *ς'*, and the *contraction* *ς*, has each of them its *proper appellation* and *appointed situations*. As a substitute for the ancient *Æolic digamma* to denote the Number 6, the character *ς'* is placed between the letters *ε* and *ζ* ; it is one of the three *episèmons*, introduced in each of the three ranks of the 24 Greek Letters, on account of their deficiency to make up *UNITS, TENS, and HUNDREDS*, viz. *επισημον Tav Κοππα* and *Σανπι*. But the *contraction* *ς* is universally placed among the Greek contractions between *ρ* and *υ*, it being an abbreviation of the *two letters, sigma and tau*,

consequently such Greek *contraction* of *two letters* can have nothing to do, (*as a contraction*,) with the *separate* or *individual letters of the Greek Alphabet*, among which it *never has any place*, and, therefore, cannot by any possible means be entitled to any *numerical value*, unless the said stenographical *contraction* ς be *proved* to be of *one and the same import* with the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Upsilon\alpha\nu$, or *cypher* ς' , which is impossible ever to be done. It is therefore evident that neither the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Upsilon\alpha\nu$, or *cypher* ς' , nor the *contraction* ς were ever used in the *calculation of NAMES or WORDS*; for it would be contrary to common sense and to their *known* orthographical and numerical uses, to remove them out of their respective places for purposes so fictitious and illegitimate, and it would be as reasonable to call the LETTER O, in the *English language*, and the CYPHER 0, or the LETTER I and the FIGURE 1, by the same appellation, on account of their apparent *similarity*. But *this similarity* does not constitute their 'homogeneity,' because their *offices* are different, the one being employed in *orthography*, and the other in *calculation*, so that when we see the one among *Letters*, and the other among *figures*, we are able at once to distinguish their respective uses and *appellations*, and the same thing may be said of the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Upsilon\alpha\nu$ (ς') and the *contraction* (ς).

It is certain then that there is *more reason* for *retaining* the (ϵ) in the *name* $\Lambda\alpha\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, than there can be for Mr. Faber's process of *identifying* BLASPHEMOS with APOSTATÈS, converting *sigma* and $\tau\omicron\upsilon$

(σ) into the *contraction* (ς) in the word Αποσλατης, writing it *contractedly* Αποςατης, and finally using the said *contraction* ς, as if it were the επισημον or *cypher* ς', for *each* LETTER must be taken SEPARATELY and NOT *contractedly*, in calculating *words* or *names*, according to all Greek authorities extant, and the example of Irenæus ; and to depart from this established custom or rule approaches nearly, in my opinion, to an *impeachment* of God's *perfect word*. For if such spurious *orthography*, *etymology*, *homogeneity*, &c. as Mr. Faber has introduced on the present subject, be allowed to pass current for *orthodoxy*, whilst Irenæus is *overlooked* in silent contempt ; the *result* must be that there will be an END to all *ancient authorities* and *established rules* of calculating *Greek NAMES*, *words*, &c. although there must have existed some *known* and STANDARD RULE, as well in the time of St. John as of Irenæus, or why has the Apostle furnished us with the sacred number χξς', 666, and exhorted us to " COUNT the NUMBER ? "

I will readily admit that there is a legitimate propriety in using the επισημον Fav, or *cypher* ς' to denote the number 6, in *unison with* the 24 LETTERS of the Greek Alphabet, when calculating NUMBERS, but NEVER when calculating *the NAMES of MEN*, nor even WORDS of *any description* ; and I say so for this plain and obvious reason—that an επισημον, or *cypher*, is *no* LETTER or LETTERS ; or why should it be designated by Greek grammarians επισημον Fav, or επισημον only ? It were useless to have given this character or *cypher* a *distinct appellation* and *form*, if it were

not for a specific use ; and *not* to preserve this distinction is to introduce confusion among the 24 GREEK LETTERS, the THREE *επισημα*, and the *general Greek CONTRACTIONS OR LIGATURES*.

I will also admit that *one form* of the *επισημων* *Ταν*, or cypher *ς'*, bears a singular resemblance to the *form* of the regular contraction of *sigma* and *tau*, or *ς* ; but this is likewise the case with the CYPHER *nought* 0 and the LETTER O, in the English language ; yet it would be preposterous to admit that because the Greek or English characters before mentioned resembled each other *in form* and appearance, that, therefore, they must be *synonymous with each other*, which is *contrary to FACT* ; because they were originally designated by *different appellations*, which they *retain to the present day*. Mr. Faber must therefore search into the Records of Antiquity to disprove the existence of such a truism. And until it is settled beyond dispute that the aforesaid *επισημων* or cypher *ς'* is *synonymous* with the *regular Greek contraction* *ς* (or *σλ*) ; or that it may be *orthographically* and *numerically* used AS the *representative* of *sigma* and *tau*, when written CONTRACTEDLY, there must ever remain an *ambiguity on the subject* ; for it is most obvious from all Greek grammarians and lexicographers who have noticed this *stenographical cypher* *ς'*, that, whatever resemblance it may bear to the Greek contraction *ς*, the former has a peculiar definite situation and appellation allotted to it, in order to distinguish its numerical *Use*, *Form*, *Name*, and *Locality*, as well from that of the CONTRAC-

TION ς , as from the *regular* LETTERS of the *Greek Alphabet*, among which the episèmon ς' has no positive station, neither has it any place whatsoever among the stenographical contractions or ligatures of the Greek Letters, of which there are very many—and when the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\tau\alpha\nu$ is used in unison with the 24 Greek Letters of the Alphabet, to denote the Number 6, then it is immediately placed between ϵ and ς in the numerical space occasioned by the absence of the obsolete Æolic Di-gamma, which was *anciently used to express the Number 6*, but the LOCALITY of which was FAR ENOUGH REMOVED from *sigma and tau*. Therefore, until this *ambiguity* is cleared up, Αποστατης can never, by the spurious and unorthodox use of the episèmon ς' , as if it were the *numerical representative* of the contraction ς , produce the genuine Number 666. Consequently, after all the pains and labour which Mr. Faber has taken, which are certainly very great, in order to confirm the use of the word *Apostatès* as the supposed figuratively impressed name of the numbered Beast or Man, it is most unequivocally true that Mr. Faber's ORTHOGRAPHY, ETYMOLOGY, HOMOGENEITY, &c. are infinitely more objectionable than those of Irenæus, whose testimony he has so complacently rejected: for the word *APOSTATÈS* is not only erroneous because of a necessary HIATUS produced on the one hand by the spurious introduction and use of the episèmon ς' ; and a *redundancy of numbers*, occasioned by the calculating of the *individual Letters of the word* on the other: but the *word itself*, which is

certainly *not the NAME of any MAN*, admits of far too general an application to any lapsed church or schism, which is in a state of Apostacy from the Faith, (αποστασία της πίστεως) though totally distinct from, and unconnected with the *Roman* or *LATIN Church*, of which I shall give sundry examples hereafter, leaving it to the candour of Mr. Faber and my other Readers, to judge whether there be sufficient force in my Remarks.

CHAPTER IV.

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON THE NUMERICAL CYPHER
DENOMINATED *επισημον* **Ϝ**, OR **V**, OR **Ϛ**, OR **ς'**, AS
USED TO DENOTE THE NUMBER 6, AND TO SUPPLY
THE VACUUM OCCASIONED BY THE ABSENCE OF
THE OBSOLETE ÆOLIC DI-GAMMA.

I SHALL now proceed more particularly to point
out the marked and necessary distinction existing
between the *επισημον* **Ϝ***av*, or stenographical *cypher* **ς'**,
and the *contraction* or *ligature* of *sigma* and *tau*, *ς*.

In truth, I cannot imagine any thing more pre-
posterous than an attempt made, in this age to prove
that an *επισημον* or *stenographical* CYPHER, OR INDE-
FINITE CHARACTER may be ORTHOGRAPHICALLY used
as the *legitimate representative* of TWO DISTINCT
LETTERS of the Greek Alphabet *in the formation of*
the NAME of a MAN, or indeed of any *word, words,*
or sentences, which are simply composed of LETTERS,
unless it be first of all admitted that the said *επισημον*

or stenographical *cypher* may and ought to have assigned to it a *numerical value* equal to that which those TWO distinct LETTERS, (contractedly,) are supposed to represent in calculation. For example: If the *episèmon* or *cypher* ζ' may be legitimately used as the representative of *sigma* and *tau*, contractedly, ζ, as in the word Αποστατης; then it follows as a natural and necessary consequence, that the said επισημον, or *cypher* ζ', being of the self-same power as the said two Letters *sigma* and *tau*, the contraction ζ must be equal to the said numerical power in calculating those two Letters *uncontractedly* σλ, i. e. 500; for it is useless to affirm that the επισημον or *cypher* ζ' is allowed for the purpose of representing the two Letters Σ and Τ at one time, and yet that it has not the same power as those two Letters at another time, which would be a palpable contradiction in terms, and, therefore, if the επισημον or *cypher* ζ' may in every case be considered as *equal to*, or used in the same manner as the *contraction* or *ligature* ζ or σλ, then the επισημον or *cypher* ζ' must in every way be equal to the contraction ζ; but the επισημον or *cypher* ζ' is not in any possible case equal to the contraction ζ, because the former is equal to the Number 6, and the latter (in its *contracted* form) signifies no number, but in its *uncontracted* form is equal to 500; therefore, if the *episèmon* ζ' is the supposed representative of *sigma* and *tau* ζ or σλ, as the latter TWO LETTERS are *equal to* 500, so must the former (as the representative of the latter,) be equal to 500; because 'things which are equal to

the same are equal to one another.' But as the *επισημον* or stenographical character ζ' is a *cypher*, and no letter, or letters, of the Greek alphabet, and is used for the number 6: so it cannot possibly be the true representative of the well known contraction or ligature ζ, either in *Letters, Identity, Utility*, or *orthographical appellation*, because of its distinct locality, appellation, and numerical uses, as set forth in the Greek grammars. The episemon ζ' is never classed with the 24 letters of the Greek alphabet, nor is it to be found among the numerous Greek contractions or ligatures of certain definite letters, and the only place where it is to be found is in the *UNIT Class of Numerals*, which consists of *this Cypher*, with the Eight First Letters of the Alphabet.

It must be observed then that the cypher ζ', called by grammarians *επισημον* *Ψαν*, or episemon ζ' is used as a *numerical character*, that it ¹existed in St. John's time, and was invented to supply the place of the obsolete Æolic di-gamma or double gamma, anciently used for the number 6. The *three characters* or *cyphers* denominated *επισημον* *Ψαν*, 6... *επισημον* *Κοππα*, 90... and *επισημον* *Σανπι*, 900, have been collaterally used not AS, but in unison with the Letters to make up their deficiency, for the purposes of common calculations, and not for the unintelligible and unorthographical use of making the word *Αποστατης* subserve the object of Mr. Faber's hypothesis, which would

¹ See *three* examples of this numerical *episemon* ζ' in Irenæus, lib. V. c. xxix. p. 446 and 447. Edit. Grabe, Oxon. 1702.

convert the cypher ς' , equal to 6, into the contraction ς equal to nothing, though its *component Letters* are equal to 500. If it could ever be established that the *επισήμων* or cypher, or character ς' , may be used in the same manner as *sigma* and *tau*, *contractedly* and *uncontractedly*, (as it may be without doubt, if it can be proved equal to, or homogeneous with the contraction ς ,) that is, first with the power of 6, or 6,000 ;—then, 500, or 500,000, just as it may suit the taste of the writer, (and if it be possible that the two letters of the contraction ς or $\sigma\tau$ may be used separately when the number of any *name* is to be calculated ; for *names* are always *composed of Letters*, and NOT *Cyphers*,) then there would be no end to the vain and frivolous speculations which must ensue from such arbitrary use of a *quadruple power*, and consequently, no Greek word, or name of a Man, which had the Greek contraction ς in it, could ever produce any *specific* or *satisfactory number*, on account of the capricious use thus made of the *episèmon* ς' , as identical with the contraction ς . For as the *episèmon* ς is already equal to 6, and 6,000 ; if the *episèmon* ς' be equal to the contraction ς , the latter is also equal to 500, and 500,000, because *sigma* and *tau*, which are equal to the contraction ς , are separately or *uncontractedly* equal to the latter numbers, according as the Mark (similar to an acute accent, as ') is placed *above* or *below* them. [See the Table at the end.] Who, then, on these data is to decide the merits of the question at issue ? Mr. Faber ? or Grecian antiquity ? Surely the latter !!!

The three Episèma or Stenographical Cyphers have no necessary or specific affinity, reference to, or dependence upon the 24 Greek LETTERS, either in *contracted* or *uncontracted* form, being totally independent of them, because the latter are alone used in calculating Names, &c. ; nor are the three ἐπισήμα any of the regular *contractions*, or *abbreviations*, or *ligatures* of *certain Greek letters* ; as is manifest by their distinct appellations and irregular *ex-alphabetical situations*, when they are used among the Greek letters for the purpose of calculation. Mr. Faber, with all his ingenuity and logic, cannot find the two stenographical cyphers, Κοππα, which is denoted by the characters Ϝ...Ξ...Ϸ and Σανπι, which is written Ϙ', either among the regular Greek contractions of letters themselves, in any Greek *Lexicon* or *Grammar* extant : for each of these stenographical cyphers has a certain *definite* and *independent* appellation, which it most distinctly retains, when used *among* (not *for*) the letters of the Greek Alphabet in calculating numbers, and this is their *ONLY legitimate use*, for they have nothing to do with the genius of the Greek language or of Grecian *orthography* ; nor indeed are they ever seen in any *Greek words* or *names* of any kind, and therefore must be rejected from such *equivocal* position, because if they are once made to *correspond with*, *represent*, or *usurp* the places of the LETTERS, they are no longer of that specific use for which they were primarily invented and adopted as *numeral characters* or cyphers.

Moreover, if the *επισημον* or cypher ζ' were in truth the same character as the Greek contraction of sigma and tau, or ς, why then is the former called *επισημον* *Ταυ*, or episèmon ζ', by Grammarians? Is it not for the sake of distinction, and that we may avoid such a confusion of *orthography* as that which Mr. Faber, Archdeacon Wrangham, Bishop Bossuet, and others have introduced in the spurious use of the episèmon ζ' for the contraction ς in the word *Αποστατης*, by supposing them to be of one and the same numerical value? The truth is, the episèmon ζ' is a cypher and numerically equal to 6, or 6,000; but the stenographical contraction of sigma and tau, ς, is of no numerical value whatsoever; for if it were equal to the latter in *Letters*, it would also be equal to it in *numbers*, i. e. 500, or 500,000, which we know from all grammarians and lexicographers is not true. Moreover, if the episèmon ζ' were derived from the stock of the ancient Æolic di-gamma, 'by rounding off its angles,' as the learned Dr. Marsh, Bishop of Peterboro' (although combated by Mr. Faber,) concludes, from its being used in the *sixth place* among the letters, when calculating the Number 6 by means of *one single character*; (instead of the two separate letters, alpha and epsilon, (αε) or bêta and delta, (βδ') which are commonly used to denote 6 in names;) then it proves worse than nothing for Mr. Faber's very whimsical argument, which *rests* upon a mere *PROBABILITY*; and this even according to *his own admission*. I consider, therefore, that Mr. Faber has asserted much, but proved nothing satisfactorily:

and that it would have been far better if he had left this numerical enigma as he had stated it in his¹ *first work on this subject*, in which he very properly sanctioned the opinion of Irenæus concerning the name *Λατῆινος*. It would, I repeat, have been better if he had not commenced *de novo*, by introducing the subject in a most unintelligible point of view in his² “*Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*,” by the use of the word *Αποστατης*, which, in my humble opinion, is the most unsatisfactory substitute which he could have chosen, knowing, as he must have known, how much polemical discussion had been already ventured to no settled purpose on this sacred enigma.

There is reason to admit that the *επιστημον*, or stenographical cypher ζ', is very properly used to denote the number 6 in calculating numbers *indifferently*, and, that, in *one form of it out of four*, it bears some tolerable resemblance to the contraction ς; it may be likewise noticed that *one form of the SIGMA* (s) out of four has also a tolerable resemblance to the contraction ς, as well as the *episèmon* ζ', but they are not very difficult to distinguish; besides which, the meaning of the Greek word *επιστημον*, if I mistake not, implies, I might say determines, that it ought to have a *mark* (similar perhaps to an acute accent) either *above* or *below it* (ζ' or ς) as its *distinguishing characteristic*, and with which it is,

¹ Dissertation on the Prophecies relative to the great period of 1260 Years. Vol. ii. p. 335.

² Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. chap. iv. from p. 240, to 242.

or ought to be, invariably written, so that it may be described in Latin phraseology—"Signum, in quo aliqua sunt signa, quibus ab aliis discernitur." This SIGN or MARK Mr. Faber has very prudently omitted in the same way that he has left out the *circumflex accent* (˘) over the *iota* in the name *Λατῆινος* after having *rejected the epsilon* (ε)—he has also *omitted the epsilon and circumflex accent* over the *iota* in the name *Τῆιταν* by writing it *Τίταν*, which shews at once that he is more ready to reject a *letter ... circumflex-accent and mark ..* merely because he wishes that they should not be there, than he is to bring forward authorities to prove that *his orthography is legitimate*.

But I never can admit, without very substantial proof, the propriety of metamorphosing the *επισημον* or cypher ζ' into an *identity* with the TWO LETTERS Σ and Τ, of which the contraction ζ is decidedly composed, and then using them *ad libitum*; for how can an *episemon* or cypher be wrested into an equality with two Letters but by a forgery of Orthography? since it is evident that two stenographical characters which are decidedly different in their appellations, meaning, use, and numerical value can never be one and the same character at the same time; but the moment it is the one, it ceases to be the other: so that either the *επισημον* or cypher ζ' is the regular contraction ζ (or σζ) or it is NOT. Now the *επισημον* or cypher with the *mark above it* (ζ') is equal to 6; and the same *επισημον* by a *subjoined mark* (ς) is equal to 6,000; and the regular contraction

ς being equal to two separate letters σ and τ, which, when used *separately* or *uncontractedly* in calculating *names, words, &c.* (the method always adopted by the Greeks in reference to the 24 letters of the Greek alphabet) are equal to the combined numbers of 500, or 500,000;¹ but the contraction of στ, i. e. ς, is never used to denote any number, and therefore, whatever *resemblance* the *episèmon* may bear to the *contraction*, or the *contraction* to the *episèmon*, they are in reality no more assimilated to one another than the Cypher nought 0 is to the Letter O.

It must therefore be difficult to conceive how concinity, homogeneity, or any similar process can amalgamate these two distinct characters together; for every Greek student must know that the contraction ς is an abbreviation or ligature of two letters; but that the *επισημον* Ταυ, or cypher ς', is merely an arbitrary character occasionally introduced between E and Z to represent 6, in lieu of the obsolete Æolic di-gamma, and as the substitute for A and E (αε) when it is more convenient to represent the number 6 by ONE NUMERICAL CHARACTER or cypher than by TWO *separate letters*; which letters (viz. α and ε) are generally used for the number 6, when the cypher ς' is not employed. Moreover, if the *επισημον* Ταυ be used by grammarians *as a double letter* belonging to the Greek Alphabet, then of course it must be the ancient Æolic di-gamma revived in some

¹ See the Table of Numbers at the end of this work.

stenographical form of it; but it is certain that it was anciently used for 6, being put in the 6th place among the letters, viz. between ϵ and ζ , and this circumstance would not in the least facilitate Mr. Faber's argument, because Γ or $\Gamma\Gamma$, and ς or σ^7 , are obviously different from each other. It is evident, therefore, that the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Gamma\alpha\nu$, or Cypher ς' , with a MARK over it similar to an acute accent, demonstrates that it is a *cypher*, and nothing but a cypher, and numerically equal to 6; but to make the stenographical episèmon ς' , synonymous with the abbreviation of *sigma* and *tau* ς , which is unquestionably equal to *two separate letters*, is to make 6 equal to 500, and 6,000 equal to 500,000, a result preposterous enough where "*wisdom*" and "*understanding*" are to be in special exercise. And as Mr. Faber has so ingeniously discovered that "*Blasphemy denotes Apostacy*," perhaps he can equally demonstrate in what manner the two letters Σ and Υ may be made to *denote* the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Gamma\alpha\nu$ or cypher ς' , a discovery which very happily has not yet been made by the learned in the past or present generations; although the ingenuity and subtilty of the learned *Bishop Bossuet* and other *Romanists* have been employed in order to produce such a belief among the credulous. However, the Apostle Paul exhorts Christian men to ¹ "*Prove all things*" ... and then ... to "*hold fast that which is good*," and by this rule, *Bishop Bossuet*, and an anonymous writer who has pub-

¹ 1 Thess. v. 21.

lished a work, entitled “ *Les Précurseurs de l’Anti-christ*,” at Lyons in 1817, *Mr. Faber*, his coadjutor, *Archdeacon Wrangham*, and others, must re-examine their premises, which are founded on FICTION and *not on FACT*.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE RESULT OF THAT BRANCH OF MR. FABER'S
HYPOTHESIS, WHICH IDENTIFIES THE EPISÈMON ς'
WITH THE CONTRACTION ς .

To set up and establish *de novo*, that because *one form* of the *episèmon* ς' , and the *contraction* ς , are somewhat similar in appearance, they are therefore the same in utility and purpose, is to do violence both to common sense and experience. It is contrary to all grammatical precedent as it respects *orthography*, and decidedly tends to undermine and vitiate the Integrity of the Greek characters, by confusing the LETTERS, CYPHERS, and CONTRACTIONS together, which have for generations past been preserved *distinct*, as well in use as in appellation. Moreover, such a commixture would lead the divinity student into the most useless and perplexing ambiguities upon SETTLED POINTS; and here I shall perhaps be excused for introducing some remarks upon the futility of Dr. Adam Clarke's endeavours to prove

from the ARABIC *tongue* that the *original*¹ HEBREW word נָחָשׁ *nachash*, which the SEPTUAGINT *translators* have rendered by ὄφις, was *not* the SERPENT, but the APE or OURAN-OUTANG. How preposterous truly are the *modern criticisms* vented both on a NAME and an EPISÈMON, against the most indubitable testimonies of *Holy-writ*, *Grammar*, and *long-established use*! How arrogant and contemptible the ingenuity, arguments, and assertions of learned men, who aspire to the appearance of more wisdom than ever the Spirit of Inspiration vouchsafed to MOSES, or to CHRIST, and his APOSTLES, who, in allusion to the words of Moses, have applied the² word ὄφις (which has *no other meaning than that of SERPENT*,) to the DEVIL and SATAN. Whatever respect then, or deference may be due to the learning, piety, gifts, and opinions of Dr. Adam Clarke as an oriental scholar, Biblical critic, and commentator, it is nevertheless evident that the unprecedented latitude which the learned Doctor has taken in explaining the HEBREW word נָחָשׁ NACHASH, ὄφις, or SERPENT, which tempted³ EVE, has not contributed to the *satisfaction* of the religious world, any more than pleased those of his own communion. The Doctor, to supply a fancied deficiency in the HEBREW *Original*, has, by recourse to the ARABIC and its *derivatives*, (because IT seemed more to serve his particular purpose,) sacrificed truth to a vain imagination. To this end he has put his etymological

¹ Gen. iii. i. 4.² Matt. x. 16. 2 Cor. xi. 3. Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2.³ Gen. iii. 1, compared with 2 Cor. xi. 3.

genius to the stretch to find out meanings never contemplated by the sacred penmen. But as the *Greek Septuagint* has rendered the *Hebrew word* שֶׁרֶפ by ὄφις or SERPENT, and the *Greek Text* of the New Testament has admitted the same reading—ὡς ὁ ΟΦΙΣ Εἰδὼν ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ,—“As the SERPENT beguiled EVE through his subtilty,” &c. it must be the imperative duty of every Christian to receive this sure and infallible testimony of the HOLY SPIRIT by the hand of the *Apostle PAUL*, who, although he wrote his Epistles to the primitive Christian churches in *Greek*, was nevertheless, a JEW, as he says, in comparing himself with other apostles—“*I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.*” “Are they HEBREWS? so am I. Are they ISRAELITES? so am I. Are they the seed of ABRAHAM? so am I.”¹—And concerning *circumcision*, and the *Tribe* from which he sprung and the *Sect* to which he belonged—he says, “*Circumcised the eighth day, of the STOCK of ISRAEL, of the TRIBE of BENJAMIN, an HEBREW of the HEBREWS; as touching the LAW a PHARISEE.*”² Moreover, St. Paul in declaring his *Conversion*, has informed us of the name of the *city* in which he was born, the *person* by whom, and the *manner* in which he was educated, from which we may infer that he was *learned* in the “*LAW of the FATHERS,*” and in his *defence of the Gospel* he declares himself a JEW, and spoke to the people in the HEBREW TONGUE, after the following manner,—“And when there was made

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 5, 22.

² Philip. iii. 5.

a great silence, he spake unto them in the HEBREW TONGUE, saying, *Men, Brethren, and Fathers, hear ye my defence* which I make now unto you, (and when they heard that he *spake in the HEBREW TONGUE* to them, they kept the MORE SILENCE; and he saith,) I am verily a man which am a JEW, *born in TARSUS, a City in CILICIA*, yet brought up in *this City*," (viz. Jerusalem) "at the *feet of Gamaliel*, and TAUGHT according to the PERFECT MANNER of the LAW of the FATHERS,"¹ &c. Now then it is most unreasonable to suppose that St. Paul, who was a Jew, and an *inspired Apostle*—and who calls himself an "HEBREW of the HEBREWS"—and declares that he was "*taught according to the PERFECT MANNER of the LAW of the FATHERS*," could have been ignorant of the 3rd Chapter of the Book of Genesis, wherein the Original Curse was pronounced upon the נָחָשׁ *Nachash* or "ὄφις, or Serpent: seeing that the *same Apostle* WROTE *his* EPISTLES to the CHURCHES in GREEK, with which LANGUAGE, therefore, he must necessarily have been *thoroughly conversant*. It is clear enough what was the *opinion of St. Paul* concerning the *Nachash* or *Serpent*,² and to *disbelieve his Testimony* is to *invalidate the TRUTH of GOD'S WORD*, which is a *hazardous experiment*. Furthermore—as ALL the APOSTLES were endued with the *miraculous GIFT of TONGUES*³ by the *Agency of the HOLY SPIRIT*, under whose *immediate influences* they spake with *New Tongues* on the *day of Pentecost*, and by whose *instrumentality*

¹ Acts xxi. 40; xxii. 1—3.² 2 Cor. xi. 3.³ Acts ii.

they were subsequently enabled to write the NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES, (and ALL SCRIPTURE is *given by INSPIRATION of GOD*,"¹) so THEY would have been able, in *enditing the GOSPELS, EPISTLES*, and the Book of Revelation, to have *discerned* what was "*the MIND of the SPIRIT*,"² in reference to the word נָחָשׁ *Nachash*, which, by the *Septuagint*, is translated "ΟΦΙς, and to suppose the *contrary* of this, is to *believe MAN rather than GOD*, and to place *Dr. Adam Clarke* upon *higher scriptural ground* of INSPIRATION and INTERPRETATION, than CHRIST or *his APOSTLES*; for, if the HOLY SCRIPTURES be the STANDARD of *divine knowledge and truth*, then it is clear enough that the novel Opinion of the learned Doctor is GROUNDLESS; for it not only comes under the class of "DOUBTFUL DISPUTATIONS;"³ but under the censure of God himself, concerning whose sacred "ORACLES" St. Paul says,⁴ "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Again: ST. JOHN in his *Revelations* has afforded us an additional testimony to the word ΟΦΙΣ as being originally applicable to the NACHASH or SERPENT.⁵ Καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ Δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ΟΦΙΣ ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλέμενος Διάβολος, καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλάνων τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, Καὶ ... ὁ ΟΦΙΣ, &c. "And the *great DRAGON* was cast out, that *old SERPENT*, called the *DEVIL*, and *SATAN*, which *deceiveth the whole world*:"—"And" ... "the *SERPENT*," &c. Also the same evangelist has repeated his testimony on this subject in similar words,⁶

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Peter i. 19—21. ² Rom. viii. 27. ³ Rom. xiv. 1.

⁴ Rom. iii. 2 and 4.

⁵ Rev. xii. 9, 15.

⁶ Rev. xx. 2.

Καὶ ἐκράτησε τὸν Δράκοντα, τὸν ΟΦΙΝ τὸν Αρχαῖον, ὅς ἐστι Διάβολος καὶ Σατανᾶς—“ And he laid hold on *the Dragon*, that *old SERPENT*, which is the DEVIL and SATAN.” Moreover, Christ admonished his Disciples to be¹—φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ΟΦΕΙΣ—“ Wise as SERPENTS,” no doubt in allusion to the expression of Moses; and can it be doubted that He knew the *character* and *proper designation* of THE NACHASH? To do so would be scepticism indeed! We have then the concurrent testimony of CHRIST, ST. PAUL, and ST. JOHN; and to deny their *threefold* testimony (as well as that of the *Septuagint*,) concerning “ the *old Serpent*” is to make the HOLY SPIRIT the author of falsehood. CHRIST imputes to the ΟΦΙΣ or SERPENT—“ *Wisdom*.” ST. PAUL “ *guile*” and “ *subtilty*,” and ST. JOHN “ *deceit*,” but Dr. Adam Clarke has not advanced any proof in favour of the *imaginary* wisdom of the *Monkey species* ABOVE the SERPENT. Wherefore, as the Greek word ΟΦΙΣ never means an *Ouranoutang*, but *only a SERPENT*, and Dr. Adam Clarke has not proved his point in the least degree from the HEBREW, surely the ARABIC meanings can never be considered *conclusive*, while they are AT VARIANCE with the ORIGINAL TEXT of the GREEK TESTAMENT; for if we admit that the ARABIC derivation ought to be preferred to the HEBREW use, we shall presently establish the PAPAL SYSTEM, of preferring the LATIN translation to the HEBREW and GREEK ORIGINALS.

I now leave the *Nachash* of Dr. Clarke to its fate,

¹ Matt. x. 16.

and proceed more at large to consider the complete inconsistency of Mr. Faber in the very erroneous view he has taken of the *επισημον* Fav or cypher ζ', which demonstrates *his orthography* to be *utterly spurious*, and indefensible before the *correctness* of IRENÆUS whose *orthography* MUST stand, until some far more *accurate grammarian* than Mr. Faber shall arise to supplant it.

It is evident that Mr. Faber has carelessly or intentionally *omitted* an important point (to which I have already alluded) connected with the *επισημον* or cypher ζ', viz. that it ought always to have an accent or *Mark of distinction* placed *above* or *below* it: how else are we to know *its numerical value*? When the *Mark* is placed *above*, it is equal to 6; but when the *Mark* is placed *below*, it is equal to 6,000—thus χξζ' is equal to 666, but χξζ to 666,000, the proof of which I have shown more clearly in an *Alphabetical and Arithmetical Table at the end of this work*. How then the literary world can know *when* the *επισημον* or cypher ζ' used *without the Mark* denotes 6, and *when* 6,000, remains for Mr. Faber to demonstrate!! And little as may be thought of this OMISSION, the *fact is*, that it destroys the *stability* of his argument; for when the THREE *επισημα* OR CYPHERS are used numerically among the *Greek* LETTERS, then this *Mark* is the *distinguishing characteristic* of *each* in calculation, without which there would be no means of ascertaining the precise number belonging to any NAME, WORD, &c. unless the number were written in words at full

length, as $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\epsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\epsilon\acute{\xi}$, instead of the numerals $\chi\acute{\xi}\varsigma'$.

Indeed there is no satisfactory reason which can be given for the use of any *one* of the *three* $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$ or *cyphers*, in lieu of the regular LETTERS of the Greek alphabet, when calculating the number contained in the NAME of any MAN, Woman, City, Church, Kingdom, &c.: for the same reason which would admit ONE $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ to such ALPHABETICAL use and order, would likewise admit the *other* TWO: but happily no instance or evidence can be adduced for *such promiscuous use* among the *ancient Greeks*, nor was ever dreamed of till the *Rev. George Stanley Faber*, *Archdeacon Wrangham*, *Bishop Bossuet*, and others, invented this unintelligible scheme; and their authorities are sufficiently *modern*, and co-eval with *Dr. Adam Clarke's* interpretation of the נַחַשׁ *Nachash*, and in my opinion quite as absurd. I would therefore plainly put the question to *Mr. Faber*, and ask him how the numerals $\chi\acute{\xi}\tau\tau'$ could possibly produce the number 666? and this is surely coming to the point! He would answer, no doubt—Put ς and τ together, and make a CONTRACTION of them—thus ς ; but when this is done the contraction ς must remain a contraction, and (whatever resemblance the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ ς' may have to the CONTRACTION ς) the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ continues an $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ from the nature of its use. And it has been proved that the CONTRACTION ς is equal to the TWO separate LETTERS $\sigma\tau$, and the two separate letters $\sigma\tau$ are equal to 500, therefore the contraction,

if used as a *numeral*, is equal to 500—add to each the letters $\chi\xi$ —and ‘if equals be added to equals the wholes are equal’... $\chi\xi\sigma\tau$ is equal to $\chi\xi\varsigma$; but $\chi\xi\sigma\tau$ is equal to 1160, therefore $\chi\xi\varsigma$ is equal to 1160, and by Mr. Faber’s hypothesis $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ is equal to $\chi\xi\varsigma$... therefore 666 is equal to 1160, ‘the less to the greater which is absurd’ ... therefore the CYPHER or EPISÈMON is NOT equivalent to the CONTRACTION : and thus we PROVE that the *conclusion* of Mr. Faber is *not founded upon true premises*.

Moreover, as the ancient Æolic DI-GAMMA formerly occupied the 6th place among the LETTERS of the Greek alphabet, so it was then used numerically for *six*, and possibly for this reason, that as the *single gamma* (being the *third* LETTER) was used for the number 3, so the *di-gamma* was used for 6, because twice 3 = 6. Furthermore, as the *di-gamma* was originally put in the *sixth* place among the Letters to denote 6, so it is more than probable that the *episèmon* ς' which has occupied the 6th place (of the *obsolete di-gamma*) must be equal to 6. And on the same ground, if, (as Mr. Faber supposes,) the *contraction* ς be the *same character* as the *episèmon* ς' —then the *contraction* ς is also equal to 6. But I have shown that σ and τ in their UNCONTRACTED form are equal to 500, and 500,000, and that the *episèmon* ς' or ς , is equal to 6, and 6,000, and therefore some mode of clearing up these glaring incongruities, and of establishing their quantities and qualities according to some *consistent rule*, must be sought :.. this *Rule* Mr. Faber has either overlooked or rejected.

After sundry other observations, Mr. Faber very complacently instructs us in the following manner:—

¹ ‘ IV. At the close of these remarks, I cannot refrain from noticing *the very singular manner* in which the CONTRACTION OR CYPHER ζ came to be employed for the purpose of expressing the *Number 6.*’

If Mr. Faber himself ‘ cannot refrain from noticing the *very singular manner* in which the CONTRACTION OR CYPHER ζ came to be employed for the purpose of expressing the Number 6 ; ’ how can we ‘ *refrain from noticing* ’ his most astonishing singularity in *coupling* the *επισημον* Ταυ, or CYPHER ζ’, with the CONTRACTION of σ and τ, or ζ, and *omitting the MARK over the EPISÈMON ζ’*, as if no such *Mark* had ever existed, which *Mark* however *denotes it*, in the clearest manner possible, to be the EPISÈMON or CYPHER ζ’, and NOT *the contraction* of σ and τ or ζ. Mr. Faber has also *left out* the ε both in Λατῆινος, and Τῆιταν, together with the *circumflex accent*, Λατῆινος. . . Τῆιταν, and has written them each with an *acute accent* as Λατίνος. . . Τίταν, contrary to the example of Irenæus, and all the other Greek writers. He has also converted βλασφημος into Αποστατης ; and, lastly, he has employed the *επισημον* Ταυ, or *cypher ζ’* as the *representative* of the CONTRACTION ζ in the word Αποστατης. Hence we infer that there is no sort of fairness, either in his argument or orthography.

¹ Faber’s Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, Vol. iii. Book V. Ch. iv. P. 238.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE THREE EPISÈMA, WITH A NUMEROUS
SELECTION OF AUTHORITIES FOR THE USE OF
THE MARK (') OVER THE EPISÈMON OR CYPHER
ς.

THERE are *two other* επισήμα or *cyphers*, (besides the επισήμον Υ av, V. ς. or ς') the *first* of which is called Κοππα, the *characters* are thus written Ϡ. ς or Ϡ', with the *Mark above* Ϡ' it is equal to 90 ... and *below* Ϡ, to 90,000 ... and the second cypher is the επισήμον Σανπι, the character of which is ϡ' (so called because composed of the ancient σιγμα inverted, with *a part* of the greek π enclosed) and with the *Mark above* ϡ' it is equal to 900, but *below* ϡ it is equal to 900,000. Now then as the Apostle John wrote his Revelations in the *Greek Language*, in which Book the number Ϡξς' or 666 is found, and as he informs us there that *Jesus Christ* is ¹ “ the Αλφα ” (Α) and Ωμεγα (Ω)

¹ Rev. i. 8, 11, 17; xxi. 6; xxii. 13.

“ The FIRST and the LAST,” therefore we conclude that the *two* LETTERS, Α and Ω, were the *First* and *Last Letters* of the *Greek Alphabet* in the days of St. John ; but the *επισημον* or *cypher* called Σανπι ϑ’ is evidently placed by Grammarians *after* Ω, which is the *last Letter* of the Greek Alphabet, and, therefore, though apparently composed of two separate Letters, yet we know that it cannot be used *for* such two letters, inasmuch as that it is neither to be found in the Greek Alphabet, *nor among the numerous greek contractions*, and that it is always placed *after* Ωμεγα ; it must therefore be a forgery to attempt the insertion of this character within the limits of the *greek alphabet* in the present day. As for the *episemon* Κοππα . . . Ϡ. Ϛ or ϛ’ it is clear enough that it has neither the appellation of, nor resemblance to any *Greek Letters*, or *Contractions* whatsoever, and consequently cannot be admitted among either of them, but is only used occasionally to denote 90, or 90,000. It may be observed here that the last form of the Κοππα is somewhat like the *Hebrew* ל *lamed*. Why then should Mr. Faber be so zealous as to prefer one particular form of the *επισημον* Ϡαν, or cypher ϛ’ when it has, I believe, *three other forms*, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, for him to decide which of them approximated the nearest to the original character ? If however he could determine the point to the greatest possible nicety, still the *επισημον* would continue to be the *επισημον* or *cypher* ϛ’ to the last. I should be glad therefore to learn from Mr. Faber what *double letters* of the

greek alphabet the two last mentioned *επισημα* (viz. Κοππα and Σανπι) may be entitled to hold in the *alphabetical scale of the greek LETTERS* or *table of CONTRACTIONS*? For if the substitute of the obsolete δι·γαμμα, which is now styled *επισημον* Ταυ, or ς' may be revived with the established novel power of two distinct letters—σιγμα and ταυ . . *contracted*—why may not the other two *επισημα* or cyphers assume the form and value of *double letters*, or the *ligatures of such*? (viz. Κοππα, the characters of which are Ϡ. Ϛ or ζ' . . . and Σανπι, the character of which is Ϙ.) Till the precise and individual value of these two latter *επισημα* be established beyond controversy, I conceive that Mr. Faber's argument proves nothing for the 'homogeneous' interchange of βλασφημος and Αποστατης, and his subsequent calculation of the *επισημον* or *cypher* ς' as if it were the true and undeniable Representative of the *contraction* ς or στ; which is most absurd, because the *επισημον* or *cypher* ς has *not been proved* to be the legitimate and orthographical representative of the *contraction* in calculating *names of Men, cities, words, &c.* For the same reason that would raise the *επισημον* Ταυ or *cypher* ς' to the rank and numerical value of the *contraction* ς, which is equal to *two Letters*, would also raise the *επισημον* Κοππα . . . and *επισημον* Σανπι to a similar rank and numerical value with certain *contractions* or *Ligatures of certain other Letters*. Such a system however must inevitably do away with the present order and established value and intention of the three *επισημα* or numerical cyphers, which were

merely introduced for *numerical purposes* and to supply the deficiency of the Greek Alphabet which consists of twenty-four Letters.

If Mr. Faber had wished to make a complete NAME of a MAN, answerable to the “*wisdom*” and “*understanding*” of which St. John speaks, it is certain that he would have had recourse to the twenty-four LETTERS of the *greek alphabet*, and to them only, in the same manner Irenæus has, by the production of *three proper names* as Εὐανθας . . . Λατῆινος . . . and Τεῖταν . . . and in which method IRENÆUS has been followed by HIPPOLYTUS MARTYR . . . ARETAS . . . and all judicious commentators who have written upon the *Number 666*; but to render the word βλασφημος synonymous with Αποστατης, and then to convert the επισημον Φαν or cypher ς' into the *contraction* ς, is no mark of a scholar; for after all is said and done, APOSTATÈS must remain an *indefinite* and ANONYMOUS character, having nothing whatever to do with the *name of a MAN*—whereas it must be remembered that it is the NUMBER *conjointly with* the NAME of a MAN of which St. John speaks; for the NUMBER of a MAN must *imply* the NAME of a MAN, and the NAME of the MAN must *imply* the LETTERS of HIS NAME, and the LETTERS of HIS NAME must CONTAIN “the NUMBER of HIS NAME” which is declared to be χξς' or 666, but of which a numerical επισημον or cypher can be no legitimate PART; because, by the *spurious* use of the episemon ς' as the *supposed representative* of the *contraction* of στ or ς in the word Αποστατης an HIATUS

is, thereby produced by the ABSENCE OF THE CONTRACTION ς which is *equal to two letters*; viz. σ and τ : or a REDUNDANCY OF NUMBERS is produced by the *retention* of the *said two Letters* in their UNCONTRACTED *form*, whereupon comes the *destruction of Mr. Faber's opinion* . . and, therefore, the *indefinite* word Αποσας or Αποσλας in its CONTRACTED OR UNCONTRACTED *form*, can have *nothing to do* with the NAME OR NUMBER OF THE BEAST, which is that of a MAN, whose *proper* and *Appellative Name* has been *better* CONJECTURED upon more *authentic* PREMISES by St. Irenæus, &c.

It may be noted here that when any of the foregoing επισημα are used *in unison with* the LETTERS of the greek alphabet, they INVARIABLY *specify* NUMBERS and *not* LETTERS OR CONTRACTIONS *of any sort or description*, and that therefore, according to the *Greek mode of calculation*, they ought to have a *small Mark, similar to an acute accent*, OVER them as ς' OR UNDER them as ς_1 and so with the other two επισημα (viz. Κοππα and Σανπι) in order to shew their *distinct numerical power*, i. e. whether they are meant to denote 6, or 6,000 . . . 90, or 90,000 . . . 900, or 900,000. And this *little Mark, or Dot, or Accent* ($\text{ι}'$ -) in whatever form it may be made is *enough*, not only to distinguish the *episèmon* ς' from the contraction ς (which latter has *no such Mark, or Dot, or Accent* belonging to it at any time, and *consequently no such number* as the *episèmon* ς' , because the *Mark* is the *distinguishing characteristic* of the *number* represented by it) but it equally

demonstrates the *insufficiency* of *Mr. Faber's argument* and *orthography*; for the *omission of this Mark* renders them null and void, [see my remarks annexed to the TABLE of the GREEK LETTERS, &c. at the end of this work], and if this subject were propounded to the most learned *Grecians* for their impartial decision, I have not the smallest shadow of a doubt that they would immediately give their verdict in favour of *retaining this distinctive Mark*. At all events IRENÆUS in the *three following instances* uses the MARK ABOVE the EPISÈMON ζ'.

¹ καταλλήλως οὖν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔξει τὸν ἀριθμὸν χξζ'.

And in speaking of the height and breadth of Nebuchadnezzar's image, he writes—

μέχρις ἧς ἡ τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσωρ ἀνασταθεῖσα εἰκὼν, ἥτις ὕψος μὲν ἔιχε πηχῶν ἐξήκοντα, εὖρος δὲ πηχῶν ζ'.

And in expressing his opinion concerning what the *Number of the Name of the Beast* should represent, in whom all apostacy, and injustice, and wickedness, and false prophecy, and deceit, would concentrate, he says—

τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ὡς εἴρηται, σημαίνουσι τῷ ὀνόματος, εἰς ὃν συγκεφαλαιῶται τῶν ζ' ἐτῶν πᾶσα ἀποσασία, καὶ ἀδικία, καὶ πονηρία.

See also the WORKS of GALEN in 3 vols. folio, (*Greek*), published at BASIL 1538, wherein the *episèmon ζ'* (with the *Mark over it*) is of frequent occurrence.

¹ IRENÆ. Lib. V. cap. xxix. p. 446, 447. Edit. Grabe. London, 1702.

GREEK GRAMMARS.

The following GREEK GRAMMARS have the *Mark*, or *Dot*, or *Accent* placed *above* the *episèmon* ζ', when denoting the *Number* 6, viz.

The PORT ROYAL GREEK GRAMMAR.

A most copious Greek Grammar, entitled, 'UNIVERSA GRAMMATICA GRÆCA. Per Alexandrum Scot, Scotum. LUGDUNI, 1614.' Page 637. . . . ζ' ἐκτῇ.

A very copious GREEK GRAMMAR, published in PARIS, 1655, entitled, 'Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre facilement LA LANGUE GRECQUE.' Livre I. page 16, 17.

A GREEK GRAMMAR, published at PARIS, 1649, entitled, 'Les Declinaisons Grecques.' Page 226.

A GREEK GRAMMAR, published at GOUDA, in South Holland, in 1684, by Joannes Verwey. Page 10.

A WESTMINSTER GREEK GRAMMAR, printed by Bonhamus Nortonus, 1634; another by John Redmayne, 1647; another by Edward Leedes, Master of the Grammar School at Bury in Suffolk, 1690; all of which, with many others, have the *Mark over the episèmon* ζ'.

GREEK LEXICONS, &c.

Also : in SCAPULÆ LEXICON,¹ under the head “*De Græcorum Notis Arithmetice compendium ex HADRIANI Amerotis scriptis*” ... and “*HERODIANI de iisdem tractatus :*” we have the *episèmon* ς' with the *mark*, or *accent*, or *dot* over it as in the following examples, wherein the said *episèmon*, when used to *denote* the *Number 6*, or any GREATER number connected with *SIX*, is so written.

ΠΙ.ς' ἐξ	VI. 6. sex.
ΔΠΙ.ις'	εκκαιδεκα.	XVI. 16. sexdecim.
ΔΔΠΙ.κς'	εικοσι ἐξ..	XXVI. 26. viginti sex.
ΔΔΔΠΙ.λς'	XXXVI. 36.
ΔΔΔΔΠΙ.μς'	XLVI. 46.
[Δ]ΠΙ.νς'	LVI. 56.
[Δ]ΔΠΙ.ξς'	LXVI. 66.
[Δ]ΔΔΠΙ.ος'	LXXVI. 76.
[Δ]ΔΔΔΠΙ.πς'	LXXXVI. 86.

Also : in a *Lexicon* entitled, “*Pædagogus Græcus, sive LEXICON Latino Græcum,*” &c. by *Jacobus Bayer.* (Editio Quarta.) MOGUNTIIUM. 1741. In *Appendix*.

Tabula et Notæ Numerorum.

6 ς' ΠΙ.

Also : *Stephens's Greek Concordance* of the New

¹ SCAPULA in Appendix ad Lexicon. Edit. Genevæ. An. 1616.

Testament—" *Stephani CONCORDANTIÆ Græco-latinae Testamenti Novi.*" (Editio secunda.) GENEVÆ. 1624, has *the mark over the episèmon*, as ζ'.

GREEK TESTAMENTS.

So also: the following EDITIONS of the GREEK TESTAMENT, *British* and *Foreign*, have the *mark* placed *over the episèmon* ζ' in the number χξς'

Novum Testamentum Græcè. ARGENTORATIUM. Apud Wolfium. A. D. 1524	
..... Græcum. VENETIIS. Melchioris Sessæ.. A. D. 1538	
..... Græcè. BASILÆ. Apud Nicholaum	
..... Brylingerum..... A. D. 1548	
..... Græcum. Ex Bibliotheca Regia. LUTETIÆ. A. D. 1549	
..... Græcè et Latinè. PARISIIS. Apud Robertum Granlon..... A. D. 1549	
Testamentum Novum, &c. Bezæ Annotationes. GENEVÆ..... A.D. }	1564
	1589
Novum Testamentum Græcum. Excudebat. Henricus Stephanus A. D. 1576	
..... Græcè et Latinè. <i>Ad Romanæ correctionis</i>	
..... amussim LUGDUNI..... A. D. 1612	
..... Textui Græco conjuncta est versio Latina	
..... <i>Vulgata</i> , summorum Pontificum, SIXTI	
..... V. et CLEMENTIS VIII. LUTETIÆ PA-	
..... RISIORUM..... A. D. 1628	
..... cum Versione Latina Ariæ Montani, auc-	
..... tore Johanne Leusden. AMSTELODAMI. A. D. 1698	
..... Græcè. Joannis Gregorii, &c. nuper Archi-	
..... Diac. Glocestriensis. OXONI..... A. D. 1703	
..... Græcè. Wetstenius. AMSTELÆDAMI.. A. D. 1711	
Novum Testamentum Græcum. Christianus Schoettgenius.	
..... VRATISLAVIÆ, vel LIPSIÆ..... A. D. 1765	

Also; the Greek Testaments of ERASMUS, MILL, GRIESBACH, BLOOMFIELD, VALPY, with many other editions, have *the mark over the episèmon* ζ'.

So that upon the whole we may rest satisfied, from the unanimous authorities of GRAMMARIANS, LEXICOGRAPHERS, NEW TESTAMENT Editors, and a *three-fold use* of the *episèmon* by IRENÆUS, that this *Mark*, similar to an *acute accent*, would have been *obsolete* or *suppressed* had it been immaterial to the designation of the *επισημον* or *cypher* ς' as distinct from the *contraction* ς; but its *past* and *present retention* (even in PAPAL EDITIONS of the *Greek Testament*), is conclusive enough for my argument. Furthermore, this *episèmon* ς' is PLACED by Grammarians BETWEEN ε and ζ, when used as a numeral to express 6; but if it be true that it is none other than the *contraction* ς (or σ,) how is it that we do not find the *episèmon* ς', placed BETWEEN ρ and υ in the regular TABLE of GREEK CONTRACTIONS? What, then, can be clearer than that this *episèmon* ς' is *not the same* as the *contraction* ς? Can it be consistent with reason to suppose that its *true place* is BETWEEN *Epsilon* (ε) and *Zeta* (ζ,) at one time, and BETWEEN *Rho* (ρ) and *Upsilon* (υ) at another? I must confess that such *loco-motive arrangements* are beyond my comprehension, yet Mr. Faber uses the "CONTRACTION OR CYPHER" as synonymous; but *Lycophron* and his Commentator *Tzetzes*, must settle this point with him. It is certain that the same thing cannot be predicted of the other two *επισημα*—viz. Κοππα and Σανπι, for they are no where to be found among the twenty-four GREEK LETTERS of the Alphabet, nor in the TABLE of the GREEK CONTRACTIONS, and, therefore, they

must remain *stationary*. I would further observe, that when the *episèmon* ς' cannot be used for the Number 6 among the *Letters* for calculating *Names*, &c. then the *letters* α and ϵ are its *equivalents in number*—as ($\alpha\epsilon$;) because α' equals 1, and ϵ equals 5; or else $\delta\beta'$ or $\gamma\gamma'$ would equally produce the Number 6. And if neither the *episèmon* ς' , nor the *LETTERS* $\alpha\epsilon$, &c. are used to denote the number 6, then the *monosyllable* $\xi\xi$ is its legitimate substitute; so that there is no sort of difficulty in making the Number 6 with the *Letters* of the Greek Alphabet, without having recourse to the *episèmon* ς' . In short, the 24 *LETTERS* of the Greek Alphabet are *always sufficient to calculate any numbers* contained in *Names of Men, Cities, Kingdoms*, &c. without the introduction of the three $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$, which are used only in calculating *NUMBERS*. The simple circumstance of the *episèmon* ς' having been *numerically placed BETWEEN* the 5th and 7th *Letters* of the *Greek Alphabet* to denote 6, shews most clearly that it is neither *one*, nor *two* *Letters*, nor *the power of either*; but a *distinct character* introduced into the vacuum of the di-gamma, arbitrarily filled up, when it is more convenient to express the Number 6 by *one cypher*, than by *two separate letters*, which are equal to it in point of numerical value—viz. $\alpha\epsilon'$ or $\delta\beta'$ or $\gamma\gamma'$.

Mr. Faber has not produced one single example of the assumed use of the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *cypher* ς' for the *contraction* ς , which, in truth and reason, he ought to have done in order to satisfy the old school

of Divines, as well as to ground an Argument for discarding the Epsilon (ε) in *Λατῆινος*; and when he has done so, we shall be better prepared to agree with him about the further propriety of interchanging the word *βλασφημος* with *Αποστατης*, for which I cannot see any justifiable reason, either on *scriptural* or on *classical ground*.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE PROPER USE OF THE MARK OR ACCENT,
WHEN PLACED ABOVE OR BELOW THE *ἐπισημον* *Ταν*,
OR, CYPHER *ς'*, WITH THE PROBABLE ORIGIN AND
USE OF THE SAID EPISÈMON.

FROM the abundant evidence given in the preceding Chapter, it may be considered conclusive, that the MARK being placed ABOVE the EPISÈMON *ς'*, when it denotes 6 among the *Letters* of the Greek alphabet is then the CHARACTERISTIC distinguishing it from the form of the stenographical contraction of *σ* and *τ*, or *ς*, which never has, nor can have, any such *Mark* either *over* it or *under* it at any time or place; for it is always the same in form and value wherever you may find it in words, whether in the *beginning* or *middle* of a word. It is only *one form* of the *ἐπισημον* or *cypher* *ς'*, which has induced Mr. Faber to suppose it to be of the same import with the *contraction* *ς*, but the other three forms of it *Τ. V. ς.* are so totally *dissimilar* to the *unchanging form* of the *contraction* *ς*, that there is not the slightest room

for comparison or confusion. Moreover, as I have said before, all grammarians place the well-known contraction ς in *alphabetical order*, among the *sigmas*, i. e. between *Rho* and *Upsilon*, and NOT between *Epsilon* and *Zeta*, as is always the case when the *episèmon* or *cypher* ς' is brought forward to denote 6, and consequently put in the 6th place; and it may therefore be concluded, from the SITUATION of the *episèmon*, when used *among the letters*, that it is either derived from the *Æolic Digamma*, and ought to be pronounced—*Episèmon Gau ... Tav ... Tav ...* as a Classic of great reputation supposes: or it is a *stenographical form* of the Di-gamma Γ , by ‘*rounding off its angles*, in the writing of running-hand; and AROSE OUT OF *the original form* of the *di-gamma*,’ which is the opinion of the learned Dr. Marsh, Bishop of Peterboro’; and I am inclined to believe that both these opinions are correct, because the *episèmon* Γ or ς' occupies the very place of the ancient Digamma, and is used for the same numerical purposes, namely, to denote 6—and that EVERY CAPITAL LETTER in the Greek Alphabet, (of which the Digamma was formerly one) has a SMALL CHARACTER to represent it, and generally two or three others: (vide Greek Grammars) besides, the Greek term $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha\nu$ being annexed to it, demonstrates that it is different in *appellation* from any of the GREEK LETTERS, or CONTRACTIONS, for although every small Greek Letter, as $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$, &c. is entitled to a Mark above and below it for arithmetical purposes, yet we are never accustomed to call them,

episèmon α' ... or *episèmon* β' ... or *episèmon* γ' ... or *episèmon* δ', &c. It appears to me that the *av* (which may be omitted) is put *after* the *episèmon* by Grammarians to give it a *hard* or *long* sound—to distinguish it from the *single gamma*—and to give us the *proper pronunciation of the character*, as Gau, Fav, Tav.

The Latins have sometimes used the Æolic Digamma F, by *turning it upside down* to express the LETTER V, and it is very probable from this circumstance that the *Æolic Digamma* (designated by Grammarians *Episèmon* F or *Episèmon* Fav) has obtained its *present Grammatical appellation* of ... Fav ... both from its *similarity* to the *Roman Letter* F, and its being occasionally used to represent the *Letter* V.

I will here give one example from Hubert Goltzcius' Thesaurus,¹ for such ancient usage—' Δ, Digamma Æolicum, pro V. ut AMPLIAÆIT TERMINAÆIT Q. DIAI. JUÆENTUTI. OCTAÆIA. VII. ÆIR EPULON. XV. ÆIR. S. F. Adverte hic Æolicum digamma Δ, contineri ea figura, quali ab Imp. Ti. Claudio adjectum tradit Priscianus. Claudius enim prioribus litteris tres adjecit, teste Suetonio, qui in vitâ ipsius ita refert: Novas etiam commentus est litteras tres, ac numero veterum, quasi maximè necessarias, addidit. De quarum ratione cùm privatus adhuc, volumen edidisset, mox princeps, non difficulter obtinuit, ut in usu quoque promiscuo essent. Extat talis scriptura in plerisque libris, ac diurnis titulisque operum.'

¹ Goltzcius. Thesaurus Rei Antiquariæ. P. 285. Edit. Antwerp, 1644.

It may be presumed then that the *episèmon* ζ' is some distinct character of an arbitrary form, introduced for arithmetical purposes, and for arithmetical purposes only : for what reason can be given that the said *episèmon* should have two different appellations, and occupy two distinct situations ? Can it be supposed that amid such a vast variety of stenographical Contractions or Ligatures of Letters, the *Contraction* ζ was the only proper character to represent the *επισημον* Ταν, or *Cypher* ζ' ? when, before the introduction of the said *episèmon*—the *Di-gamma* was used to denote the number 6—and αέ' or βδ', or γγ' would at any time specify 6, as far as it respects the LETTERS of the *Greek Alphabet*. It is evident that as the *επισημον* or *Cypher* ζ' is the local representative of the *Di-gamma* in calculations, and that the *Di-gamma* or its representative is no part of the contraction ζ ; so there can be no more reason alleged for choosing the CONTRACTION ζ (which is most certainly and unequivocally composed of, and equal to TWO DISTINCT LETTERS,) than there would be for choosing αέ', which are TWO DISTINCT LETTERS, to denote 6, for this plain reason, that if Mr. Faber's hypothesis were true, then the contraction ζ would not only denote the Nos. 6 and 6,000, but since the contraction ζ is equal to the TWO SEPARATE LETTERS σλ, the contraction ζ would also denote 500, and 500,000, which is most ridiculous, because the contraction ζ is never used for arithmetical purposes. As for the two *επισημα* or *Cyphers* Κοππα and Σανπι, they are evidently not in a

form common to any known *Letters* or *Contractions*, but *distinct characters*—and the *episèmon* Σανπι θ' is wholly *supplementary* to the Greek Letters and Contractions, and is neither one Letter nor two Letters, though perhaps compounded in form of *parts of two*. It must therefore be acknowledged that the *two episèma*, or Cyphers, Κοππα and Σανπι, which are occasionally used *amongst* the Letters, have been admitted into *alphabetical* (or rather *ex-alphabetical*) order, for *no other than arithmetical purposes*; that is, to denote TENS, and HUNDREDS; and consequently that the *επισημον* Ταυ, or *Cypher* ζ', which has been adopted for arithmetical purposes only, viz. to denote UNITS, can be no more necessary to the *framing of a Word, or Name of a MAN*, than either Κοππα or Σανπι would be, which is not at all. Therefore I am bold to say, that Mr. Faber will scarcely venture to try the experiment with the *two latter* *επισημα*, though he imagines he has succeeded so well with the *former*. So much then for those *probabilities* which Mr. Faber informs us, *amount to "moral certainties."* It is highly probable that the *επισημον* Ταυ, or Cypher ζ', has been formed from the ancient di-gamma Γ by 'rounding off its angles,' (as Dr. Marsh thinks); but if not, there is no more reason why we should marvel at the *similarity* of the *episèmon* ζ' to the *contraction* ζ, than at the *dissimilar forms* which anciently existed between the *same Letter*; for example, take *Sigma*, Σ, σ, ς, c. It were just as reasonable and necessary to endeavour to account for the *already-existing difference* between

the *four several forms* of the *sigma*, as between the *four several forms* of the *episemon* τ_{av} , that is, τ . ν . ς . ς' . Custom having fully confirmed their optional use and value, which is enough so far as concerns *Antiquity* and *Orthography*.

We shall perceive then, at one glance, the proper use of the *Mark* or *Accent*, when it is placed, first *above* and then *below* the *episemon* ς' or ς , as also *when applied to the small Letters of the Greek alphabet* with regard to the *NUMBER* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666, whereby we shall see the *defect* and *inconclusiveness* of *Mr. Faber's argument*.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1st. With the two Greek Letters χ and ξ and | } above $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ = 666. |
| the <i>episemon</i> ς' , with the Mark | |
| | below $\chi\xi\varsigma$ = 666,000. |
| 2nd. With the 2 Greek Letters χ and ξ , and | } above $\chi\xi\sigma\tau'$ = 1,160. |
| the Letters which represent the con- | |
| traction ς , viz. $\sigma\tau$, with the Mark | below $\chi\xi\sigma\tau$ = 1,160,000. |
| 3rd. With the 2 Greek Letters χ and ξ , which, | } above $\chi\xi\alpha\epsilon'$ = 666. |
| with the 2 letters $\alpha\epsilon'$ will produce, | |
| with the Mark | |
| | below $\chi\xi\alpha\epsilon$ = 666,000. |

Thus it is evident that although Mr. Faber has exchanged $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\phi\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$, with a view of obtaining the *number* 666 of the *MAN*, yet, on account of the difference existing between the *episemon* ς' and the *contraction* ς , both as to their *proper epithets*, *local situations*, and *numerical product*, the word *APOSTATES*, when *fairly* or *UNCONTRACTEDLY* written in *GREEK LETTERS* bids defiance to the legitimate establishment both of the *NUMBER* 666, and the *NAME OF A MAN*, which cannot certainly be made

out by any rendering of the *word*. It therefore must be entirely rejected, as erroneous in regard to *orthography*, *numerical value*, and every other quality which is essential for its reception. But *Δατῆινος*, which is the true *name of a MAN*, and every way answerable to the Number 666, remains as firm as ever, notwithstanding the ingenuity which Mr. Faber has exercised with a view of supplanting it by the indefinite *word* APOSTATÈS.

Furthermore; I naturally recoil from this mode of giving our enemies, the Romanists and others, so important a vantage ground, which we undoubtedly should, were we tacitly to give up such, or any other material point in *orthography* or *divinity*. For allowing the followers of *Socinus* to reject the *Definite Article* & and to substitute the *Indefinite*, (see *Bishop Middleton* on the *Greek Article*;) or permitting *Bishop Bossuet*, and other *Romanists*, the vicarious, arbitrary, or indiscriminate use of the *ἐπιστημον* or *cypher* ς' (as if it were actually and truly the *contraction* ς or σ7, and used to denote 6,) would be a similar point of concession, and much too important an one for us to yield. Let us recollect that as *Protestants* we have nationally separated ourselves from the *Church and Communion of Papal Rome*, and that on account of *this* our *National and Ecclesiastical Separation*, the *Church of Rome* has *most summarily* branded us with the appellation of APOSTATES and HERETICS, &c. Yet surely an Ecclesiastical separation from the *Church of Rome* needs not imply *Apostacy* or *Heresy* on our part,

retaining as we do every jot and tittle of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS, together with the *Liturgies*, *Formularies*, &c. of the ancient Greek and *Christian Churches*, rejecting nothing but the *false* and *base traditions of Men*, even the dross of their LATIN or *Papal superstitions*, and thus using the pure word of God (in *plain English*) in a Language fully understood by the common People, as did the primitive Christians. The *Roman* or *LATIN Church* (for so she is proved to be at this very hour—‘*LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC Regnant*,’) will meet with an insurmountable difficulty in attempting to apply the *Name* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ to US, for WE LATINIZE in nothing; but she in every thing of an Ecclesiastical Nature and Purpose. And thus because we have renounced all civil and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction with *Papal Rome* and her *LATIN Hierarch*, therefore, we are as a *French Roman Catholic* would say, ‘*De hors de l’Eglise*’—without the pale of the Church. If, however, we are desirous of finding out the true Name of the MAN, whose given arithmetical Number is $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, we must search for the NAME of such a MAN, and then having discovered such Name, we must endeavour to apply it to the ‘*Number of his Name*’ by just arithmetical computation, that is, by placing every individual Letter of the Name, as each stands in its regular order in the *Table* or *Scale of the Greek Alphabet*, with the precise *Number of each Letter* severally annexed, which will then decide whether the name of the MAN will produce the given number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or

666 ; and if it will NOT *produce the precise Number* by the *individual Letters of his Name*, it must be rejected as insufficient, and this is the *simple process* to which EVERY NAME must FIRST be subjected. But to introduce an *episèmon* or *cypher* as the representative of two distinct Letters in a *Man's name*, is to produce an *Hiatus* or Vacuum in the LETTERS OF THE NAME, and thereby destroy the validity both of the *name* and the *number of the Man*. It is most curious that out of the *two Greek Letters* $\chi\xi'$ and the ONE *episèmon* ς' , $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, Mr. Faber should have chosen to convert only the *episèmon* or *cypher* ς' into two Letters and then leave the two genuine LETTERS $\chi\xi'$ to shift for themselves, as though the *episèmon* or *cypher* ς' had more to do with establishing the authenticity of the *name of the Man*, than the *regular Greek Letters*, which compose his name, and this directly at variance with the established rules of Greek orthography and numerical calculations. It is evident therefore that we must, in the first instance, have recourse to the 24 *Letters of the Greek Alphabet*, and to *them only* ; for the Name of the Man must contain the LETTERS of his Name, and *those Letters* the NUMBER of *his Name* (whatever that Name may be) in the same legitimate *Mode of Calculation* as exhibited by IRENÆUS, of which he has given us *Three Examples*, and to do otherwise is to act in opposition to his high authority and every other Greek precedent. If however it were merely an *arbitrary number UNCONNECTED with the NAME OF A MAN*, &c. then we might exercise the

discretionary power of using freely and unrestrainedly the THREE επισημα in conjunction with the 24 Letters of the Greek Alphabet, the former of which are merely introduced to make up Units, Tens, and Hundreds. I have already shown that there are three different ways in which to denote the Number 6.

First, by means of the cypher, called by Grammarians επισημον Ταυ, or σ'.

Secondly, by means of the monosyllable ἑξ.

Thirdly, by means of the Letters—αέ', or γγ', or βδ', any two of which may be used in the names of Men, &c. to denote six.

What then can be clearer, more intelligible, and satisfactory? And yet Mr. Faber is not content to go on in the straight road of Greek orthography, but prefers rather to plunge into a labyrinth of obscurity into which no one can safely follow him.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONTAINING ALLUSIONS TO THE ANCIENT NUMERICAL
USE OF THE DI-GAMMA AS CONNECTED WITH THE
SUBJECT OF THE EPISÈMON ς' .

IF Mr. Faber had discovered the *Name of a Man*, in which there were TWO GAMMAS, $\gamma\gamma$, or $\gamma\zeta$, and had then resorted to the expedient of using the $\Delta\iota\text{-}\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\alpha$ Υ , for the said *two single gammas*, there might have been *something plausible in the argument*, because the ancient Di-gamma was formerly put in the *sixth place among the regular Greek Letters*, and had the power of *six* in calculating numbers ; but to attempt the admission of *two dissimilar Letters* (*sigma and tau*, ς or $\sigma\iota$) in lieu of it, is so foreign to the purpose, that if we were to try the proof we must in the end acknowledge that 6 is equal to 500, and 6,000 equal to 500,000. It must be admitted then, that if this *Episèmon* ς' be any thing *beyond a Cypher*, it must be some one stenographical form of the ancient

Æolic Di-gamma ; and this admission would put an end to Mr. Faber's argument, which, by his own confession, rests upon supposition, or doubt, or rather '*the Doctrine of Chances.*' If the ancient Di-gamma were revived according to its primitive form, place, and use, it would be numerically equal to six, but could not make the two Letters σ and τ , *contractedly*, or *uncontractedly*, because double gamma, as Γ , or two gammas, as, $\gamma\zeta$, $\gamma\gamma$, &c. would never *denote* ς or $\sigma\tau$: but the Letters σ and τ are positively and undeniably equal to the Greek *contraction* ς because the *contraction* ς contains the Letters σ and τ ,—and, as Letters which are equal to the same Letters are equal to one another, both in numbers and in every other reference ; by the same rule of argument, *contractions* which are equal to the same contractions are also equal to one another. But the *numerical* $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or cypher ς' being no letter, nor Letters, nor the regular contraction of Letters, can neither be equal to the contraction ς nor its representative Letters ; for were it otherwise, the *episèmon* ς' having been *once acknowledged* as the *stenographical ligature* of σ and τ would immediately cease to be a cypher by becoming a contraction, (as may be seen by considering its common appellation, position, and numerical use,) and consequently must cease to be employed for the Number 6. But I have already shown that the *episèmon* or cypher ς' is not only used for the Number 6, but that the same *episèmon* (with the Mark below) ς is also used to denote 6,000 : what then is the use of

insisting on the *similarity* of the *episèmon* ς' to the contraction ς, but to confound the two characters by endeavouring to produce a belief that they ARE, or may be used AS *synonymous terms* or *characters*? Much in the same manner as we are told that ' *Blasphemy* DENOTES *Apostacy*.' Whereas, by retaining the ancient *individual use* of the 24 *Letters* of the Greek alphabet, with their several *numerical values* attached to *each letter*, there can be no possible mistake concerning the *number of the name of any Man*!! As we find the place of the επισημον Tav or cypher ς' to be *between* ε and ζ, and NOT *between* ρ and υ, in the *Table of Greek Contractions*; so we may fairly conclude that it is an *arbitrary character*, just as easily as we can that the TWO EPISÈMA Κοππα and Σαντι are *arbitrary characters*, because they are neither of them to be found among the CONTRACTIONS or LETTERS.

If we permit the επισημον Tav, or cypher ς', or Ϛ, to pass current in *orthography* for the well known contraction of σ and τ, or ς, we must in reason admit the *other two cyphers*, Κοππα, Ϙ, ϙ, or ζ', and Σαντι, ϛ', to an *equal rank and numerical value* among the LETTERS, so that they also may assume the *specific Form and Power* of certain known *Letters* in the Greek Alphabet, which is too preposterous to admit; for, as I have already shewn, they are both of them supplementary to the 24 Letters, and resemble none of the regular Greek *contractions* of LETTERS, but are placed in the three Ranks of *numerals*,—*ex-alphabetically*; therefore to attempt

their admission among them now, would be like the conversion of the *Nachash* or *Serpent* into a *Monkey* or *Ouran-outang*, (as Dr. Adam Clarke has done in the nineteenth century of the Christian æra, to the astonishment of the religious world,) and thus there would be no end to the useless *ambiguities* and confusion thereby introduced in the value of the Greek Letters by the arbitrary admission and vicarious substitution of the three *Episèma* for *regular letters*. As the three *Episèma* have never been so used in ancient or modern times—viz. Letters for Cyphers, and Cyphers for Letters,—so there can be no sufficient reason given why they should *now*, for the first time, be admitted to such arbitrary use, unless it be to accommodate Mr. Faber's opinion ; for he argues with more plausibility than truth, there being a similarity in one form between the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *Cypher* ς' , and the contraction ς . But *Grammatical Investigation* will show the positive necessity there is for drawing a broad line of distinction between the one and the other, when an instance of *orthography* is to be determined. It is obvious that one form of the $\sigma\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ (ς) is somewhat similar to the Contraction ς , as also to the *episèmon* ς' ; but they are easily to be distinguished from each other ; the *episèmon* ς' being *always used with a Mark*, and *never without it*, because it is a numerical Cypher. The Contraction ς is never seen with a Mark—and the *sigma* (ς) is known by the top part of it being somewhat shorter than the two former characters, and it has a Mark appended to it only when used as a numeral.

1st. The Character or *Cypher* called
by Grammarians $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ Fav, or ς' F. V. ς. ς' .

2ndly. The *Contraction* of the two
letters, *sigma* and *tau*, ς , as
seen in the Table of Contractions - - - $\sigma\tau$ ς .

3rdly. The *Four* several formations
of the *sigma*. - - - Σ . σ . ς . ς .

Therefore it will be absolutely necessary, not only to preserve an *apparent distinction* in point of Form, as set forth in the *Greek Grammars*, but likewise their several and well-known appellations, situations, and numerical value, by which they are always distinguished from one another; and to act otherwise is to introduce ambiguity and confusion in the place of that orthographical order and Harmony which existed before, and this derangement is but a poor apology for that indeterminate species of Orthography which Mr. Faber has propounded to us in the word Αποστῆς , a word thus proved to be totally inapplicable and inadequate for those purposes and intentions for which it has been in these aftertimes, brought forward by him, to *supplant* the *most ancient* and *generally approved name* of a ΜΑΝ, even Λατῆινος .

Furthermore—as *not one of Three Episéma* has, as far as I know, ever been admitted into the *Alphabet* of any *Greek Grammar* extant—or into the *Tables of the Greek Contractions* or *Ligatures of the Letters*, not even into Mr. Valpy's *Greek Grammar* which has the ancient Di-gamma (F) so conspicuous on the Title Page, we may safely conclude that the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ Fav, or *Cypher* ς' is *not considered* by Gram-

marians as a contraction of two Letters of any kind, but merely a stenographical character introduced into the sixth place for the obsolete Di-gamma, by which to denote six under one character, when calculating Numbers, instead of αέ or any other two letters as γγ' or βδ'—which will equally produce the number six in names of Men &c. &c. It is therefore manifest that the Three επισημα are numerically used (conjunctly with the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet) for the obvious purposes of calculating numbers but not for NAMES, seeing that they can never be requisite for that purpose. Therefore, as the ancient Grecians never used the three Episèma in the same manner as Mr. Faber has introduced ONE of them, he has therein acted contrary to all Greek precedent concerning the use of the episèmon ζ', which he has so ingeniously foisted into the word Αποστατης, but which has, in every point of view proved less than nothing for his opinion, which is most ambiguous and inconclusive if the Greek Letters only are to decide the merits of the Question at issue: that they ought so to decide is palpably evident from the sound and orthodox example of IRENÆUS. How much soever, therefore, Αποστατης may serve for any other point, it most certainly does not contain by the individual arithmetical computation of the LETTERS, the NUMBER mentioned by St. John, which is χξς' or 666, or “Six hundred Threescore and Six:” and therefore it CANNOT be the true Mark or Name of the MAN, because it does NOT produce the NUMBER of his Name, which point is the sine quâ non of the

subject. It matters little what Mr. Faber has written *against the orthography* of the NAME $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ as set forth by Irenæus, which may nevertheless be termed the *Stereotyped appellative Name* of the MAN, and contains *by PROOF* of the *most indisputable orthography*, the *true Number of the Beast*, and is illustrated in *all other respects* by the *strong clear light of scriptural allusion*, and therefore I will venture to say by way of happy and exulting anticipation, “*Virescit vulnere VERITAS!!*” and that although, “*Tempora mutantur, Mutantur Homines,*” yet—“*VERITAS eadem Manet!!!*”

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE PROPER DISTINCTION TO BE OBSERVED BETWEEN THE USE OF THE THREE EPISÈMA, VIZ. *ἐπισημον* **Ταυ** . . . **Κοππα** . . AND **Σανπι**—AND THE 24 LETTERS OF THE GREEK ALPHABET IN THE DESIGNATION OF NAMES AND NUMBERS; TOGETHER WITH SOME REMARKS ON THE NECESSITY OF RETAINING THE EXACT NOTATION OF HOLY-WRIT.

As the *ἐπισημον* **Ταυ**, or Cypher ζ' appears to be placed in the *Revelations of St. John*, (chap. xiii. v. 18) with a *Mark over it*, **χξζ'**, such *mark* is clearly meant to denote that it is a *numerical character*, (for so the very word *ἐπισημον* by derivation seems to imply, viz. *ἐπι* in addition, and *σημα*, a sign or mark,) and NOT the contraction of *sigma* and *tau*. I have before noted that the contraction ζ can *never have a Mark over it* in the *beginning* or *middle of words*, *Names*, &c. Moreover, the contraction ζ (because of its locality in the Table of contractions, between ϑ and υ,) is NOT an *episèmon* any more than the *episèmon* ζ' can be a

contraction, (because of its locality between ϵ and ζ and its distinguishing appellation when used among the Letters.) Therefore, wherever the *marked* $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *Cypher* ς' is found (as in the *present instance*) in the No. 666. $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or in *any other* GREATER or less number, ending with the *episèmon* ς' with the *Mark* above it signifies SIX, and with the *Mark* below ς , 6000; but the separate letters of the contraction ς with the *Mark* above, equal 200 and 300, as with the *Mark* below they equal 200,000, and 300,000; and by the combination of such a variety of numbers as 6 . . . 6000 . . . 200 . . 300 . . 200,000 . . 300,000 attached to the *same character*, (and its representative Letters) no one would venture to decide upon any given number; and therefore it will be absolutely necessary to observe the Rules of Grammar on this subject in order to distinguish the *true number* of the *episèmon*, from the SPURIOUS ONE allotted to the contraction. I will venture to affirm, that there is *no example on record* (except in *Mr. Faber's* and *Archdeacon Wrangham's* use of the *episèmon* ς' for the contraction ς in the word Αποστατης , and in which their adversaries the Roman Catholics had PRECEDED them, for the *same use* of the *episèmon*; it is impossible to *prove* such a thing! Will *Mr. Faber*, or *Archdeacon Wrangham*, undertake to prove that σ^7 are equal to, or may be used to denote SIX in calculating Numbers? Let us see how the novelty looks! See also the TABLES illustrative of the *fallacy* of *Mr. Faber's word* APOSTATES, CHAPTER X, of *this work*.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 A' & = & . . 1 \\
 \pi' & = & . 8 0 \\
 o' & = & . 7 0 \\
 \sigma\tau' & = & . . 6 \\
 \alpha' & = & . . 1 \\
 \gamma' & = & 3 0 0 \\
 \eta' & = & . . 8 \\
 \varsigma' & = & 2 0 0
 \end{array}$$

$$6 6 6$$

Every person well acquainted with the *ancient Mode of Calculation* among the Greeks, must know that *no two Letters so low down in the Greek Alphabet* as σ and τ can possibly be used to *denote six*, because the *lowest* Number that is *allotted to* σ is 200, and the *lowest* that is *allotted to* τ is 300 ; and, therefore, how the said *two Letters together* can be made equal to the *small number* 6, must be matter of *great astonishment*, and require explanation. Yet *such* is the ratiocination of Mr. Faber (with his coadjutor Archdeacon Wrangham), because he complacently uses the *episèmon* ς' as though it were the legitimate or *orthographical representative* of the contraction ς ('*the CONTRACTION OR CYPHER,*') which it *certainly is not*, inasmuch as the *episèmon* or *cypher* ς' could not be admissible in the calculation of the *Name of a Man, or any other Name*, where LETTERS *alone* are concerned. It seems then that Mr. Faber must have *prejudiced his under-*

standing against this view of the subject, because it would be as easy for him to prove that $\sigma 7$ is equal to 6, as that the contraction ς is equal to 6, inasmuch as they both lie open to the same objections as regard *orthography*; for, the *same reason* that would make the FIRST *equal to 6*, would make the SECOND *equal to 6*, because *Letters* which are *equal to the same Letters* are *equal to one another*; but this method of equalizing the *contraction* and *episèmon*, must necessarily introduce what may be well termed a '*System of Counter Elements*,' because it is equally *subversive of common sense and experience*.

If Mr. Faber should still insist on the legitimacy and propriety of the indiscriminate use of the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\tau\alpha\nu$ or cypher ς' for the regular *contraction* ς , then I must have CLASSICAL EXAMPLES and authorities for such arbitrary use among the *ancient Greeks*, (but Mr. Faber's '*Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*' does *not furnish us with ONE such example*,) and then having produced such examples as a preliminary step, I should also desire to have an explanation of the orthographical use of the *two other episèma*, viz. $\kappa\omicron\pi\pi\alpha$ and $\Sigma\alpha\nu\pi\iota$, which have hitherto been employed to denote *Numbers*, but not as a component *Part* of the LETTERS of *any PROPER NAME*. If the *episèmon* or cypher ς' be the acknowledged *Representative* of the *contraction* ς or $\sigma 7$, then it may with equal propriety be thought that the *episèma* $\kappa\omicron\pi\pi\alpha$ and $\Sigma\alpha\nu\pi\iota$, may also, by some ingenious process, be made to represent *certain Diphthongs* or *Letters*: so that by acknowledging Mr. Faber's argument to

be grounded on sound principles, and to have its full weight in regard to the arbitrary use of the *cypher* ζ' for the *contraction* ζ, it will be very difficult, I may say *impossible*, to decide on the *precise value* of the *other two Episèma*; otherwise than they are at present determined by Grammarians and Lexicographers. Surely then it is evident, according to *existing orthography*, that the *three* επισημα are arbitrary numerical signs, Hieroglyphical characters, or Stenographical Cyphers, occasionally introduced among the 24 Greek Letters, for the sole purpose of denoting particular numbers, (and this provision is made on account of a *deficiency* in the Greek Alphabet,) but they are by no means the representatives of *Letters*, having nothing to do with them, which is clear from the ex-alphabetical situations they occupy.

My principal object in insisting so strongly on the *preservation* of the essential and apparent distinction between the three επισημα and the 24 *Letters*, is, that there may not hereafter be *any further doubt* concerning *their respective uses*; but that when NAMES of MEN, &c. are calculated, the LETTERS *only* may be used; and *when Numbers* are to be calculated *then* the three *episèma* and *Letters* may be *conjointly used*. Thus we shall preserve a decided distinction between the three *numerical episèma* and the 24 regular *Greek Letters*, with the various *contractions* or *ligatures* of those Letters; so that holding their respective places, order, value and appellation, they will not be mistaken, or usurp the rank of each other

in the long established scale, use, and station in the *Greek Alphabet, Table of Contractions*, and the *three ranks of Numerals*, which Mr. Faber's opinion had begun to disturb. The "*wisdom*" and "*understanding*," of which *St. John* wrote, [Rev. xiii. 18.] in reference to the discovery of the *Name* of the MAN, from his enigmatical Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666, must be in accordance with the *then known RULES* of *numerical orthography*, or why should Mr. Faber take upon himself to *object to the ORTHOGRAPHY* of IRENÆUS by the *rejection of the ε* in the NAME $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, as though it were redundant? It can only be upon the *supposition* that *Irenæus* was a *bad Grammarian* in using the *Diphthong* or *broad ει* or $\epsilon\iota$, instead of the *CIRCUMFLEX iota*, ι ; but the *latter* is generally, if not always, *equivalent* to a *Diphthong*. If *Mr. Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius*, and a variety of other critical writers are justified in *publishing to the world* that it is *not legitimate orthography* to *write*, or *use the Diphthong* or *broad ει* or $\epsilon\iota$, in the *name* $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, although numerous authorities from the *Classics* and *Fathers* can be adduced in vindication of its *common use* both among the *ancient GREEKS* and *ROMANS*; much more are we justified by informing *Mr. Faber, Archdeacon Wrangham, Bishop Bossuet, &c.* that the *contraction ε* is *NOT the numerical Representative* of the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Upsilon\alpha\nu$ or *cypher* ς' , until sufficient classical authorities are adduced to *prove their coincidence*. The Scholar's guide to the solution of this subject is the examination by comparison of the *two*

characters, according to their *established use*, as set forth in the different Greek Grammars, Lexicons, Testaments, Commentators, &c.

That PAPISTS, especially the JESUITS, should endeavour to uphold their own *spurious anti-apostolic, anti-catholic*, or *LATIN Church*, by such novel inventions as the one to which Mr. Faber has resorted, is not much to be wondered at; because the said *Latin Church tolerates* (in the broad daylight of Literature, and in the meridian Sun-shine of Religious Liberty,) the APOCRYPHAL BOOKS *as equally CANONICAL* with the *Books* of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS, which is *more than the JEWS themselves have ever admitted at their very worst period*. But such a *papistical* precedent is no argument for a *Protestant* or *Christian Minister*; for the *JEW* is *still a living witness against such apocryphal admission*, even though he be ignorant of the true SHILOH. Is not the *επιστημον* *Tav* or *Cypher s'* an *Apocryphal character* according to Mr. Faber's view of it? Surely it is, because *it cannot be two characters at the same time!* And is not the contraction ς tantamount to canonical? that is to say, a Character concerning which there is *no sort of doubt existing?* It appears very evident to me that Mr. Faber has given his enemies, the *Romanists*, more vantage ground than he has taken for himself in his whimsical argument, because the word *Αποστατης* is NOT the *Name of a Man*, does not contain the number $\chi\xi s'$ or 666, and that the *Romanists* may turn round upon us, as Bishop Bossuet, and others

have done, and declare that *every Church* which is not in their *Latin Communion* is an APOSTATES.

If *Mr. Faber* had considered more of the MAS-SORA or *Masoretic System* of the ancient Jewish Doctors, whereby they have numbered the *Sentences* or *Verses*;—the *words*; and *every one of the Letters of the Hebrew Text*: he must have known the extreme tenaciousness of the Jews as to the alteration of a *single Jot* or *Yod* ך (the least of all the Hebrew Letters,) or even *Tittle* or vowel point (ֿ). And it was no doubt with reference to this well known and established Rabbinical Doctrine or System, that Christ said to the Jews, (in accommodation to their traditional Integrity of every individual Letter of the Hebrew Scriptures,) “Till heaven and earth pass, one Jot or one Tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.”¹ And the wonderful manner in which the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures have been preserved through so many Generations, amidst such a variety of *Jewish Wars, Bondages, Captivities, National Revolutions, and Dispersions*, may well be accounted as the *work of God* and *one of the greatest of miracles*; for it most clearly manifests the power and watchfulness of JEHOVAH over his own sacred word even to the very LETTER or TITTLE of it.

If the *Jews* then have been so *punctilious* in preserving entire *every LETTER* and *Tittle* of the HEBREW SCRIPTURES, shall *we*, as *Christians*, be *less punctilious* in the *preservation of every LETTER* and

¹ Matt. v. 18.

CHARACTER of the GREEK TESTAMENT TEXT ? God forbid ! Has Christ said—" Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away : " and shall it not come to pass ? Yea, verily ! we know then by parity of Reasoning, that there is as much need and propriety of *retaining* as strictly as possible the true value of *each one* of the *Greek Letters*, and Contractions, and the *numerical Episèmon* ϛ', with their proper *Marks* and *appellations*, set forth in the *original Greek Testament Scriptures*, as there was for the retention of every individual Hebrew Letter of the Old Testament writings ; for *without this accuracy*, the *fidelity of the Number* χξς' or 666, could *never* be *fully* and *satisfactorily determined* by the Church of God, (whose guide is *wisdom* and *understanding*.) And supposing the *THREE numerical Episèma*, or *Cyphers*, could have an *indefinite* meaning allowed them, first intending one thing and then another—first Cyphers and then Letters and contractions—and *vice versà*, as the case may seem to require, or as the fanciful imagination of each individual writer may lead to their adoption, then indeed they would be constantly exposed to alteration, and consequently to objection. Thus the ablest interpreters of Prophecy would always be at issue as to the *true NAME* and *NUMBER* of the Apocalyptic " MAN "—who is " *The Man of Sin,*" " *The Son of Perdition,*" even when the true Name of the Beast was found, the existence of which *uncertainty* is too abundantly evident from the *endless speculations already extant concerning the mystical Name*

of the Numbered Man. If, however, the *orthography* of IRENÆUS had been *more fully vindicated* concerning the DIPHTHONG OR BROAD *ei* or *ē* in *Λατῆρος*, NO OTHER *Name of a MAN* would have been demanded, because it is every way suitable to the *character* spoken of by St. *Paul* and St. *John*. It will therefore be seen in the sequel of this work, how important it is to attend to the *most minute points* in any *matters relating to the Holy Scriptures*, and that *Orthography* forms *no inconsiderable part* in the establishment of the *Name of the Man* whose *proper and descriptive Name* is unquestionably and indisputably *Λατῆρος*.

If the *episèmon* ζ' were written in any one of the *Three following* allowed forms to denote the Number 6, viz. Ϛ. V. Ϟ. it would materially alter the complexion of the *cypher* ζ' and place Mr. Faber in a difficult position to determine *its proximity to the contraction* Ϛ which has only *one form*, and which Mr. Faber has purposely overlooked, or carelessly rejected, together with the established adoption of the *Mark* or *Accent* ('), which at once denotes that it is an *episèmon*, and used for 6, and NOT the contraction Ϛ. These, with many other omissions, have ruined the *credibility* of his argument, which *Rests* upon the *Presumption* that the word *Αποστατης* may be substituted for *βλασφημος*, and that the *episèmon* ζ' is the literal and numerical representative of *sigma* and *tau*, contractedly, which it is not.

I take it for granted then, that any one of the *four following forms* of the same character Ϟ. V. Ϛ. ζ'

(whether it be the Æolic Digamma, or the *episèmon*, its stenographical and numerical representative) may severally and individually be used to denote the No. 6, and from which, by a comparison with the Letters ς and τ *uncontractedly*, and *contractedly*, it will therefore be my endeavor to show to the Reader in the following SCALE or TABLE of the word APOSTATÈS; *first* with the LETTERS and *contraction*, and secondly, with the LETTERS and the *Four several forms* of the *said digamma* or *episèmon*, that Mr. *Faber's argument* is not substantial, but wholly defective, inasmuch as APOSTATÈS is a word which *does not even contain the Number 666*, and I have already shown that it is *not the Name of a Man*, and likewise that it is *too general* or *Indefinite a word* to answer the purposes intended by the Apostle. Therefore as a matter of course, it must be entirely rejected. There cannot be a sufficient reason given why the Digamma or Stenographical $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu$ or *cypher* ς' (in *this individual Form* of it,) should be preferred to any one of the other *three forms*, in reference to any NAME, any more than that it would not be legitimate *orthography* to retain some *one form* of the $\sigma\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ ($\Sigma. \sigma. s. c.$) to the Rejection of the *other three forms*, and therefore we must content ourselves with the rights and privileges of *Antiquity* which are abundantly sufficient, and they are truly subversive of Mr. Faber's speculation.

CHAPTER X.

TWO TABLES

ILLUSTRATIVE OF MR. FABER'S WORD

APOSTATÈS,

EXHIBITING ITS PALPABLE INCONSISTENCY

WITH THE TRUE NUMBER

χ_{55}' OR 666.

I.

An arithmetical TABLE of the word Αριθμητικη ; with the *Mark above*.

1st. with the *two Letters* σ and τ , *uncontractedly*; and
 2ndly. with the said two Letters *contractedly*, as, ς .

A	α'	=	..	1	A	α'	=	..	1
P	π'	=	..	80	P	τ'	=	..	80
O	ϕ'	=	..	70	O	ϕ'	=	..	70
S	ς'	=	..	200	ST	ς	=	..	500
T	τ'	=	..	300						or nothing.
A	α'	=	..	1	A	α'	=	..	1
T	τ'	=	..	300	T	τ'	=	..	300
E	η'	=	..	8	E	η'	=	..	8
S	ς'	=	..	200	S	ς'	=	..	200
<hr/>						<hr/>					
Subtract the No. of the Man 666						Subtract the No. of the Man 666					
1160						1160					
<hr/>						<hr/>					
Remainder too many by						Remainder too many by					
494						494					
<hr/>						<hr/>					

II.

An arithmetical TABLE wherein is shown the Inconsistency and moral Impossibility of using the $\epsilon\pi\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ Γ_{aw} , or *Cypher* ς' as the literal and numerical Representative of $\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$ and $\tau\alpha\upsilon$ contractedly (ς) in the word $\Delta\pi\sigma\varsigma\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$.

3dly. with the *Letters*, and 4 different forms of the same *Episemon*, in lieu of the 2 Letters σ' and τ' .

A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1
P π' = ..	80	P π' = ..	80	P π' = ..	80	P π' = ..	80
O \omicron' = ..	70	O \omicron' = ..	70	O \omicron' = ..	70	O \omicron' = ..	70
ς' = ..	6	ς = ..	6	Γ = ..	6	V = ..	6
A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1	A α' = ..	1
T τ' = ..	300	T τ' = ..	300	T τ' = ..	300	T τ' = ..	300
E η' = ..	8	E η' = ..	8	E η' = ..	8	E η' = ..	8
S ς' = ..	200	S ς' = ..	200	S ς' = ..	200	S ς' = ..	200
666		666		666		666	
Subtract the episemon ς' , because it is not $\sigma\tau$..	6	Subtract the episemon } ς as before	6	Subtract the episemon } Γ as before	6	Subtract the episemon } V as before	6
and there will be a de- ficiency of Six	660	and a deficiency of Six 660	660	and a deficiency of Six 660	660	and a deficiency of Six 660	660

As the *first* of the foregoing Tables, including three forms of the word APOSTATES, presents us with LETTERS *arithmetically redundant*, that is by 494 ; so are the *four latter examples* DEFICIENT, in the second Table, (*not in Numbers*, but in LETTERS,) to the *amount of 6*, which consequently *destroys the Integrity of the Number of the Man* which is declared by *St. John* to be 666 and NOT 660 : and, therefore, it must be obvious that *all words or Names of Men*, &c. are COMPOSED OF LETTERS, and LETTERS ONLY ; for without the LETTERS there could be *no production of a COMPLETE WORD OR NAME OF A MAN*, according to the *existing rules of Grecian Orthography* ; because the *introduction of the επισημον*—or *numerical cypher ζ'* among the *Letters of the Word (or Name)* would thereby produce a *chasm* or HIATUS to the destruction of the said *Word (or Name.)* Ex. Gr. ΑΠΟΣ'ΑΤÈS ΑΠΟΣΑΤÈS ΑΠΟΤΑΤÈS ΑΠΟΒΑΤÈS, &c. &c.

Furthermore, if it can *once be proved* that it is *legitimate orthography* to introduce *one episèmon* into a MAN'S NAME, I will venture to prove also that it is equally legitimate to introduce the whole *three episèma* in like manner. Suppose, for example, that a *certain number* was proposed from which a *Name* was to be *elicited*, but in which were *three Letters* and the *three episèma*, as α β γ δ ζ'—which would *collectively* (with the *Mark above and below*) produce the number 1002 ; would any person in his senses attempt to find the *Name of a Man*, or *any other Name* composed of *Greek Letters* from *this given*

Number $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\zeta'$, or 1002, by the use of the *Three Letters* $\alpha\beta\gamma'$ in conjunction with the *three episèma* $\delta\zeta'$? It would surely be more reasonable at least to metamorphose the number $\chi\xi\zeta'$ into the *Name of a Man*! And why has Mr. Faber selected the *episèmon* ζ' and not used the two real Letters χ and ξ in the word *Αποστατης*? Is it not because the two Letters χ and ξ have nothing to do with the NAME, but ONLY the NUMBER of the MAN. The Number $\chi\xi\zeta'$ consists of two Letters and one *episèmon*, which are numerically put to represent—

χ	ξ	ζ'
ἑξακίσιοι	ἑξήκοντα	ἕξ

that is, “*Six Hundred Threescore and Six* :” but χ and ξ have nothing whatever to do, either in appearance or reality with any one Letter, or two Letters, in the word *Αποστατης*, and yet the *episèmon* ζ' must be torn from its *numerical station* to make a FRACTION of the word *Αποστατης*. Why then should we not add the two Letters χ and ξ which compose the *greater part of the Number 666*? For in truth, if it can be legitimate orthography to use the *episèmon* ζ' in the *Name of a Man*, so it must be to use the two Letters χ and ξ with the *other three forms of the episèmon*, viz. Υ , \V , ς , as also the *other two episèma*, viz. *Κοππα* and *Σανπι*. But I have already shewn the impossibility of such admission. And therefore it is extremely strange to observe the extravagancy to which men will run, in order to attempt to prove a point which *never can be proved*

by sound argument and orthography, which are alone sufficient; for such only are consonant with “wisdom” and “understanding.”

The following small *Table* exhibits the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ of *St. John*, and demonstrates the necessity of using the *Mark* above the *episèmon* ς' which is then equal to 6; but if we have the *Mark* below the *episèmon* ς the result will be that we shall produce the far greater Number 6,000,* and thereby produce by ONE SINGLE CHARACTER, or *episèmon*, 5334 more than the Number 666. Ex. gr. $5334 + 666 = 6000$, and by placing the *Mark* below the whole Number $\chi\xi\varsigma$, we shall have 665,334 MORE than the ORIGINAL NUMBER 666.

$\chi\xi\varsigma'$	$\chi\xi\varsigma$
$\chi' = 600$	$\chi = 600,000$
$\xi' = .60$	$\xi = .60,000$
$\varsigma' = ..6$	$\varsigma = ..6,000^*$
<hr/> 666 <hr/>	<hr/> 666,000 <hr/>

And if we allow the *episèmon* ς' in the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ to be used for the contraction of $\sigma\tau$, or ς , we shall have this *additional result*, that as the *episèmon* ς' is the representative of the contraction ς , so is the contraction ς the representative of $\sigma\tau$, and consequently we shall see at once the incongruity of such supposed numerical equality; because the word *Αποστατης*, uncontractedly, with the *Mark* above and below is ¹494 beyond the given Number 666, and

¹ See the Table of Apostatès.

the same word, *uncontractedly*, with the *Mark below*, is 1,159,334 *beyond the Number 666*, and therefore the *contraction* ς in the word APOSTATÈS must be given up according to the *established Rules of Grecian orthography* as connected with the *Mode of ALPHABETICAL Numeration*.

$\chi\xi\sigma\tau'$	$\chi\xi\sigma\tau$
$\chi' = 600$	$\chi = 600,000$
$\xi' = .60$	$\xi = .60,000$
$\sigma' = 200$	$\sigma = 200,000$
$\tau' = 300$	$\tau = 300,000$
<u>1,160</u>	<u>1,160,000</u>

CHAPTER XI.

EXAMPLES PROVING THE WANT OF IDENTITY IN
THE WORD APOSTATÈS, AS APPLICABLE TO ANY
ONE PARTICULAR LAPSED CHURCH OR PERSON
EXCLUSIVELY.

THE following examples may suffice to illustrate that there is *no sort of Identity* between the word APOSTATÈS and any *one particular lapsed Church, or Man*, but such as is likewise applicable to, or *synonymous* with *many Apostacies*, and therefore *Apostatès* cannot be either the *Proper*, or *Descriptive*, or *Appellative Name*, wherewith the *Latin Roman Pontiff* (with every individual in his *Latin Church*) is to be *Marked* or *Named*; for HE is in truth *as much* an ANTICHRIST as he is an *Apostatès* or *Blasphèmos*, embodying the *three characteristic Titles put together*, with many other *scriptural attributives*, such as, “ *The Man of Sin*,” “ *The Son of Perdition*,” “ *The Wicked One*,” “ *The Mystery of Iniquity*,” &c.

I. That the *Jewish Church*,¹ or CHURCH OF JERUSALEM,² was the *Primitive Christian* or *Mother Church* of all Churches in the world, in the Days of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, is evident from the *testimony of INSPIRATION*; for it was in the CITY of JERUSALEM that Christ *first planted his Gospel*, and gave a Commandment to his Disciples that it should be *from thence* preached among ALL Nations,³ “*beginning at Jerusalem*,” and in unison with this Commandment we read of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas enjoining, in the strictest manner, the implicit observance of this Divine Injunction given them by their Lord and Master, as it is written,⁴ “It was NECESSARY that the word of God should FIRST have been spoken to YOU, (i. e. the JEWS.) And it is an undoubted truth, that no Gentile was federally admitted into the Christian Church till after St. Peter was commanded in the⁵ *Vision of the great sheet knit at four corners* to go to *Cæsarea* and instruct Cornelius in the gospel, as we read⁶ “They travelled as far as *Phenice*, and *Cyprus*, and *Antioch*, *preaching the word* to NONE but unto the JEWS ONLY:” so that the *Jewish Christian Church* (of which the primitive Apostles were the⁷ *lively stones, pillars, and foundations*,) was the

¹ Acts xi. 19, 22.

² See ‘The *Ancient Liturgy* of the Church of Jerusalem, being the *Liturgy* of St. James, compared with the Account given of that *Liturgy* by St. Cyril in his fifth *Mystagogical Catechism*, and with the *Clementine Liturgy*, &c.’ London: Printed by James Bettenham. 1744.

³ Luke xxiv. 47.

⁴ Acts xiii. 46.

⁵ Acts x.

⁶ Acts xi. 19.

⁷ 1 Pet. ii. 5. Gal. ii. 9. Rev. xxi. 14. Matt. xix, 27, 28. Luke xxii. 28—30.

only Church for some time, and *She* it was who became instrumental in the conversion of the Gentile Nations to God, and therefore *was*, (in *priority of Time*,) the *Mother Church to them all*; but the same Church may *now* (as for centuries past) be styled an *Apostatès* from the Faith (Αποστασία τῆς Πίστεως), because the *Jews* have *nationally rejected Christ* and *renounced Christianity*, and, therefore, God has *destroyed their magnificent city* JERUSALEM, in which they gloried so much, and given them up, for an allotted period, to *Judicial blindness*, according to the words of *St. Paul*; ¹ “But seeing that ye *put it from you*, (the word of God,) and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we *turn to the GENTILES*.” However *this* APOSTATÈS is not final, for our Lord has *limited the time* by saying, ² “*Jerusalem* shall be trodden down of the *Gentiles*, until the *Times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*.” So also the Apostle Paul says, in addressing the Gentile Christians of ROME in a way of caution, that, ³ “If the *FALL of them* be the *RICHESS of the World*, and the *DIMINISHING of Them* the *RICHESS OF THE GENTILES*; *how much more THEIR FULNESS?*”—“If the *CASTING AWAY of Them* be the *Reconciling of the World*, what shall the *RECEIVING OF THEM* BE, but *LIFE FROM THE DEAD?*”—“They also, if they abide not in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. *Blindness in part* is happened to *Israel*, until the *fulness of the Gentiles be*

¹ Acts xiii. 46.² Luke xxi. 24.³ Rom. xi. 12, 15, 23, 25, 26, 32.

come in. And so *all Israel shall be saved*, as it is written, *There shall come out of Sion THE DELIVERER*, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." As the *Jews* were confessedly the *FIRST*, so it is to be believed that they will be the *Last Harbingers* of Messiah's glory; for although Christ was given as ¹ "a *Light* to lighten the *Gentiles*;" he was nevertheless to be the "GLORY of HIS PEOPLE *Israel*:" and this *latter event* has *not yet come to pass*, nor indeed the former but in a limited sense; and, therefore, we may fairly conclude that there is much good reserved for this ancient people of God, when ² "the *Vail shall be taken away*," for *Babylon* and *Zion* must shortly change places, it being said to the former, ³ "Come down and sit in the dust;" but to the latter, "Arise, shine; for thy *Light* is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." ⁴ "In those days it shall come to pass, that *ten men shall take hold* out of *all Languages* of the Nations, even shall *take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew*, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you:" and then, ⁵ "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

II. The GREEK, or GENTILE CHRISTIAN CHURCH was, in the days of the Apostles, *a true Catholic* and *Apostolic Church*, and *second* in order of Time and

¹ Luke ii. 32.² 2 Cor. iii. 16.³ Isaiah xlvii. 1; lx. 1.⁴ Zech. viii. 23.⁵ Hab. ii. 14.

Dignity ; nevertheless her past and present lapsed (I might say semi-barbarous) state, constitutes her an APOSTATÈS from genuine Christianity, even though she is separated from the communion of the *Latin Church of Rome*, because she has *left her primitive Faith*, and the *simplicity of the Gospel of Christ*, by being turned to “ *Old Wives’ Fables.*” Moreover, it does not certainly appear that *Rome* was even the *First Gentile Church*. Add to this, that in the time of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, the *Greek Church of Corinth* (which was *under the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Roman Emperor,*) claimed ascendancy over the *Church of Rome*, a circumstance which seems strongly to corroborate the belief that the *Greek Church* was Antecedent to the *Roman or Latin*. And that the GREEK Church was prior to the LATIN is fairly confirmed by the circumstance, that the NEW TESTAMENT (the far greater portion of it at least) was *originally written in GREEK for her use*: As therefore we believe that the *Jewish and Greek Churches* preceded the *Latin, the Church of Rome* instead of being the Mother Church of Christendom, as she impudently professes herself to be, is *no more than the THIRD*, and not literally that, because she has *seceded from the primitive Christian Church of Rome*, both in Faith and Practice, by publicly teaching the People in an “ *unknown Tongue,*” namely in LATIN, contrary to all Apostolical custom and injunction. The *Church of Rome* is *not mentioned in St. Paul’s Epistle to the ROMANS*, nor is SHE *once named* throughout the *whole of the New*

Testament, unless SHE is meant by “*the Church at Babylon*,”¹ which is nothing in her favour; and as for the *Name of St. Peter* it does not occur in the *salutation of St. Paul in his xvth Chapter to the Romans*, wherein the *Names of many Persons are mentioned*, and which, (among numerous others,) is a tacit *Proof*, that *neither the Church of Rome*, nor the *Name of St. Peter there*, were objects of such special veneration as they are now made to appear by the spurious Latin Church of Rome; besides which, during the *three first Centuries* of the Christian *Æra*, Rome did not take the precedence of other Christian Churches; but “the falling away,” or breaking up of the *Old Roman power*, prepared the way for the “falling away” of the *Christian Church*, which took place according to the prediction of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, by the Rise, Progress, and establishment of the *second or Papal Roman Beast* in the same SEAT and CITY which the *first or Pagan Roman Beast* occupied before him, of which the POPE is now the *Sovereign Representative*, being by profession the “PONTIFEX MAXIMUS” of the ROMANS—“*Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth*”—and “RULER OF THE WORLD.”

III. That the LATIN CHURCH (or CHURCH OF ROME,) which is more commonly known by the appellation of ROMAN CATHOLIC, (though *Catholic* in *no other sense* than LATIN,) is also a complete APOSTATÈS from the *Church of Christ*, which ex-

¹ 1 Peter v. 13.

isted *at Rome* in the days of St. Paul, and to which the Apostle addressed his inspired Epistle. This *LATIN (not Apostolic) Church*, began to rear her lofty Head from the dust of ecclesiastical obscurity, (i. e.¹ *out of "the EARTH"—the Roman Earth*) in the time of *Constantine the Great*, who granted some temporal advantages and ecclesiastical immunities to the *then* Bishop of Rome, (though that Christian Emperor never intended, nor suspected that his early patronage would be so vilely perverted in after-times, to such sacrilegious purposes as it has been) and this *Latin, Papal, Antichristian and Apostate Bishop of Rome*, was fully established in his Hierarchical Seat, in the Reign, and ² by the *EDICT of the Emperor JUSTINIAN*, A. D. 533, to Pope John, and afterwards confirmed by the unhallowed instrumentality of the Edict of the Regicide-Emperor and Usurper *Phocas*, to *Pope Boniface*, about A. D. 606; and this was the *origin*, this the unhallowed FOUNDATION of *Papal Supremacy* in subsequent ages, which has been exercised to so great an extent during the predicted period of "1260 Days" of Years, that we may say, the *Papal Roman Beast* has exercised³ "ALL the power of the first" (*Roman Imperial*) "*Beast.*" The Apostle Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, Chap. ii. 3rd and 6th verses, prophetically warns them of the Rise, Pro-

¹ Rev. xiii. 11.

² See the *Edicts* of the Emperors, *Justinian* and *Phocas*, quoted by 'Cunningham on the Apocalypse,' from p. 202 to 208. See also, 'Drue Cressener's judgments of God upon the Roman Catholic Church,' p. 54.

³ Rev. xiii. 12.

gress, and Establishment of the Theocratic Power of “the *Man of Sin*,” “the *Son of Perdition*,” who would “be revealed in his Time,” and that they (the Thessalonians) *knew* what *withheld* His rising, viz. the *existence of the Imperial Roman Sovereignty*, but that when “the *Man of Sin*” was fully “revealed,” he would then be seen “SITTING IN THE TEMPLE OF GOD,” to which St. *Peter’s Church at Rome*, and the *character of the Pope* as the pretended *Vicar of Jesus Christ*, (or rather, *Ruler of the World*,) bear the most circumstantial and convincing Proofs at this very Hour. However, the same Apostle tells us, that the *Revelation* of the “*Man of Sin*” would not take place,¹ “EXCEPT there come a FALLING AWAY FIRST,” ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ Ἀποστασία πρῶτον, and accordingly we find that after the *Seat of the Imperial Government at Rome* was *exchanged* for that of CONSTANTINOPLE, and the *ancient Roman power* began to *decline and fall*, under the hands of *Barbarians*, then by craft and usurpation the *Old City Rome*, by gradual and almost imperceptible degrees, *fell into the possession of the Bishop of Rome*, and, from his subsequent conduct in “FORBIDDING MARRIAGE” to *all the clergy of his Latin Church*, and “COMMANDING” the Laity “TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS” on *Fridays and Saturdays* throughout the year, the Papacy by these characteristic DECREES, has verified to the Letter the *words of the Holy Spirit*.² Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ρητῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3.

² 1 Tim. iv. 1.

καίρῳς Αποστήσονται ΤΙΝΕΣ τῶς Πίστεως. “ *Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times SOME shall depart from the faith:*” BY—¹“FORBIDDING to MARRY, and COMMANDING to *abstain from MEATS,*” which *interdicts* continue in force in the *Papal Roman Church*, even at this day, and, therefore, we know that the *Spirit of God* has expressly declared, that *her conduct in such matters* is a *full and direct “departure from the Faith”* of Christian Men; and consequently ROME, furnishes the ΤΙΝΕΣ to whom St. Paul refers as Apostatizing ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς. So also the *character* of “the *Man of Sin*” is equally portrayed by St. Paul, and *one* reason (among many others) why the POPE may be designated “the *MAN OF SIN,*” is, that he professes to have *absolute power* to “*forgive sins,*”² a prerogative which belongs to *God only*; and for the exercise of which the Jews stoned Christ, and afterwards put him to Death. Yet the Pope from his *Ecclesiastical Chancery* issues his Indulgences at a market price to every applicant, whether residing in the *City of Rome*, or the Antipodès of his pretended universal kingdom, and therefore, He, as the *Dux Gregis* of Romanists, is “*The Son of Perdition,*” even as *Judas Iscariot*,³ (who sold his Lord and Master) is *so called*, “none of them is lost, but THE SON OF PERDITION.”⁴ We conclude, therefore, that the *EXISTENCE* of the *Pagan Imperial Power* was the true and undoubted *Barrier to the previous Rise of the Pope*, who is doubtless in the plenitude of his character and Ministerial

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 3. ² Mark ii. 7, compared with John x. 33. ³ John xvii. 12.

exaltation; *the* “¹ MAN” alluded to by St. John, and foretold by St. Paul, ²even “the Man of Sin,” “The Son of Perdition;” The Roman or LATIN Pontifical MAN; for *two* such Potentates as the *Roman Emperor* and *the Pope* could never have reigned together *in the same City, at the same time*; but soon after the decline of the *Imperial Dignity* at Rome, then the *Latin, or Roman, or Italian Hierarchy* began to *arise*, the *Bishop of Rome* having succeeded to the *very Seat and Government* of the *ancient Roman Emperors*, and withal using the *Pagan Imperial Title* of “PONTIFEX-MAXIMUS,” whereby we know that HE is THE ANTI-CHRIST, inasmuch as the *Church of Rome* has most impudently exalted herself above the *Jewish and Greek Churches* (which were both of them prior to her in point of *Ecclesiastical Antiquity*, and *Spirituality of Mind*), by a pretended *Right to Supremacy, Infallibility, Ecumenical Power*, and vaunting Herself to be the *Mother Church of the whole Universe*. Thus SHE (infinitely more than the Jews of old) has “*made void the Word of God*,” not only “by her “*Traditions*,” but by *limiting the Use of the Holy Scriptures to the LATIN language*, among those of Her communion, and by thundering out her *LATIN Papal anathemas*, from the *ROMAN VATICAN PALACE*, against all *Emperors, Kings, Princes, and Potentates*, who may dare to impugn her *Latin* (or rather *Blasphemous*) *innovations*. APOSTATE, however, as this *LATIN-CHURCH* is from every thing which is fairly

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.² 2 Thess. ii. 3.

denominated Christian, yet in vain will *such a word* as APOSTATÈS be expected to produce the *true Number* or *characteristic name* of the SECOND Beast, which must be that of a MAN, for *nothing else will suffice*, and therefore, neither *Words*, nor *Sentences in Greek*, which *seem to be peculiarly appropriate*, (SUCH as *the following*,) and which *contain the exact Number* 666, can be admitted, for the plainest Reason, that *none of them can be converted into the PROPER NAME OF A MAN*, and, therefore, cannot be the true MARK of the NUMBERED BEAST, and consequently must be rejected as *insufficient*, even as the word Αποσταλης has been rejected for a *similar Reason*.

Εκκλησια Ιταλικά.

Italian Church.

Η Λατινή βασιλεία.

The Latin Kingdom.

Θεος ειμι επι γαιης.

I am God upon Earth.

Κακος Οδηγος.

Bad Guide of the way.

ITALIAN CHURCH.	$E' = .5$	$\eta' = .8$
	$\kappa' = .20$	$\Lambda' = .30$
	$\kappa' = .20$	$\alpha' = .1$
	$\lambda' = .30$	$\tau' = 300$
	$\eta' = .8$	THE $i' = .10$
	$\sigma' = 200$	$\nu' = .50$
	$i' = .10$	LATIN $\eta' = .8$
	$\alpha' = .1$	$\beta' = .2$
	$I' = .10$	KING- $\alpha' = .1$
	$\tau' = 300$	$\sigma' = 200$
	$\alpha' = .1$	$i' = .10$
	$\lambda' = .30$	DOM. $\lambda' = .30$
	$i' = .10$	$\epsilon' = .5$
	$\kappa' = .20$	$i' = .10$
	$\alpha' = .1$	$\alpha' = .1$
	<hr/> 666 <hr/>	<hr/> 666 <hr/>

I AM GOD UPON EARTH.	$\Theta' = .9$	
	$\epsilon' = .5$	
	$\sigma' = .70$	
	$\varsigma' = 200$	
	$E' = .5$	
	$i' = .10$	$K' = .20$
	$\mu' = .40$	$\alpha' = .1$
	$i' = .10$	$\kappa' = .20$
	$\epsilon' = .5$	$\sigma' = .70$
	$\pi' = .80$	$\varsigma' = 200$
	$i' = .10$	BAD $\sigma' = .70$
	$\Gamma' = .3$	$\delta' = .4$
	$\alpha' = .1$	GUIDE. $\eta' = .8$
	$i' = .10$	$\gamma' = .3$
	$' = .8$	$\sigma' = .70$
	$\varsigma' = 200$	$\varsigma' = 200$
	<hr/> 666 <hr/>	<hr/> 666 <hr/>

Many other examples of *Greek Names, Words, and Sentences* might be adduced, which *contain the Number 666*, but they are *not applicable to the general scope of the Prophecy* under consideration, such as—

ΤΕΙΤΑΝ, Titan ... ΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ, i. e. Ulpus Trajanus ... ΓΕΝΣΗΡΙΚΟΣ, Gensericus ... ΕΥΑΝΘΑΣ, Eüanthas ... ΜΑΟΜΕΤΙΣ, Maometis ... ΒΕΝΕΔΙΚΤΟΣ, Benedictus ... ΑΡΝΟΥΜΕ, Nego ... ΛΑΜΠΕΤΙΣ, Resplendens ... ὁ ΝΙΚΗΤΗΣ, i. e. Victor ... ΠΑΛΑΙ ΒΑΣΚΑΝΟΣ, Jam olim invidus ... ΑΝΤΕΜΟΣ, ... ΑΛΗΘΗΣ βλαβερός, Vere nocens ... ΑΓΝΟΣ ΑΔΙΚΟΣ, Agnus nocens, &c. &c.

The Hierarchy of Rome is built upon an apparent ‘*homogeneity*’ between the *Greek name* Πέτρος, PETER, and the *word* πέτρα, Rock, in the address of Christ to his Servant Peter in the following words—¹ “ I say unto thee, That thou art PETER, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, &c.”—but there need not much penetration to discover from the *English Language* the dissimilarity between PETER and Rock, for every Letter is manifestly different, though in the *original Greek*, as well as in the *Latin, French, and Italian Languages*, they have some resemblance to each other. In each of these Languages, however, the one is always written in the *Masculine*, and the other in the *feminine gender*, the first being the *Name of a Man*, the second that of a *Rock or Stone*, importing the *firmness and strength of FAITH in Christ*, which is very justly compared to so durable a substance as Rock or

¹ Matt. xvi. 18.

Stone; (as it is elsewhere to *Iron*, viz. an *Anchor*).
I will give them separately :

“Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρᾳ,” &c.

“Tu es *Petrus*, et super *hanc Petram*,” &c.

“Tu es *Pierre*, et sur *cette Pierre*,” &c.

———— *Pietro* ————— *Pietra*.

“Thou art *Peter*, and upon *this Rock*,” &c.

Note then, that it was *Faith in Christ* which *Peter* confessed, and NOT the NAME or PERSON of PETER which is here meant: for our Lord did not say—‘THOU art *Peter*, and upon THEE, *Peter*, I will build my Church:’ but *Thou* art PETER, and upon THIS ROCK (viz. FAITH) I will *build my Church*.” That our Lord spake of FAITH in Him under the notion of a HOUSE built upon a ROCK, is evident from the concluding words of his Sermon on the Mountain.¹ “Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which *built his HOUSE upon A ROCK*,” (ἐπὶ τὴν Πέτραν:) “and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon *that HOUSE*; and it *fell not*; for it was *founded upon A ROCK*.” (ἐπὶ τὴν Πέτραν.) And St. Paul illustrates this in the following words addressed to the Ephesians²—“Ye are *built upon the Foundation* of the *Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the CHIEF CORNER STONE*: in whom all the BUILDING fitly framed together groweth unto an holy TEMPLE in the Lord: in whom ye also are *builded together* for an HABITATION of God through

¹ Matt. vii. 24, 25; Luke vi. 47, 48. ² Ephes. ii. 20—22.

the Spirit :” and to the *Corinthians* he writes¹—
 “For we know that if our earthly *House of this Tabernacle* were dissolved, we have a *building of God*, an *HOUSE* not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with *our HOUSE* which is from Heaven.”

St. *Peter* himself testifies that *believers* in Christ the “*LIVING STONE*” are “*lively stones*,” built up a *spiritual HOUSE*,² “To *whom* coming, as unto a *LIVING STONE*, (Λίθον ζῶντα) disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, *ye* also, as *lively stones* (λίθοι ζῶντες) are *built up a spiritual HOUSE* (ἱεὸς πνευματικὸς) an holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” “Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold I lay in *Sion a chief CORNER-STONE*, (Λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον,) elect, precious: and he that *BELIEVETH* on HIM shall not be confounded. Unto *you* therefore which *BELIEVE* *He is precious*, but unto them which be disobedient, *THE STONE* (Λίθον) which the builders disallowed, *the SAME* (ὁ αὐτός) is made the *Head of the Corner*, and a *STONE of stumbling*, and a *Rock of offence*. (καὶ Λίθος προσκόμματος, καὶ Πέτρα σκανδάλου.)

St. *Paul* thus writes to the *Hebrews*,³ “*Christ* as a *Son* over HIS OWN HOUSE; whose HOUSE are *we*, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of *THE HOPE* firm unto the end.”

St. *Paul* in writing to the *Romans*, says,⁴ “That

¹ 2 Cor. v. 1, 2. ² 1 Peter ii. 4—8. ³ Heb. iii. 6. ⁴ Rom. ix. 30—33.

THE GENTILES, which followed not after righteousness, have *attained to righteousness*, even the *righteousness which is of FAITH*. But *Israel*, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath *not attained* to the law of righteousness. *Wherefore?* Because *they sought it not by FAITH*, but as it were by the works of the law. For *they stumbled* at that *Stumbling-STONE*; as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a *Stumbling-STONE* and *Rock of offence*: (Δίθον προσκόμματος, καὶ Πέτραν σκανδάλου) and *whosoever BELIEVETH on HIM* (Δίθον καὶ Πέτραν) *shall not be ashamed.*"

Now the *true* ROCK, or STONE, or FOUNDATION on which *believers* must *build their* HOUSE or HOPE of *Salvation*, is the *Spiritual* ROCK—CHRIST—and *Christ alone* (and *not* Peter Πέτρος, neither the Latin Papal Church of Rome,) as is evident from the words of St. Paul to the *Romans* (as above), and his address to the *Corinthians* in the following words¹—"Moreover, *brethren*, *I would not that YE should be ignorant*, how that *all our fathers* were under the cloud, and *all* passed through the sea; and were *all* baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did *all* eat the same *spiritual* meat, and did *all* drink the same *spiritual* drink; for *THEY* drank of that *spiritual* ROCK (ἐκ πνευματικῆς Πέτρας) *that followed them*: and *that* ROCK was *CHRIST.*" (ἡ δὲ Πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός.) Here, then, we notice that the πνευματικὴ Πέτρα, the *spiritual* ROCK (CHRIST) was with *HIS CHURCH* in the *wilderness*

¹ 1 Cor. x. 1—4.

before PETER (Πέτρος) was born, and although *Simon* had the name CEPHAS (which is a *Chaldee* and *Syriac* word,) given him by Christ, *without any testimony to Jesus as the Messias*, in these words¹—
 “Thou art *Simon* the son of *Jonas*: thou shalt be called CEPHAS, (or *Kephas*,) which is by *interpretation*, a *STONE*.” Yet, Peter, *after the death of Christ his Master*, fully and publicly declared before the *Jewish*² *Rulers*, and *Elders*, and *Scribes*, and *Annas the High Priest*, and *Caiaphas*, and *John*, and *Alexander*, and *as many as were of the kindred of the High Priest*,” who “were gathered together at *JERUSALEM*,” that He (Peter) was NOT the *STONE* on which Christ would *build his Church*, as his own defence witnesseth:³ “Then PETER, filled with the *HOLY GHOST*, said unto them, Ye *Rulers* of the people, and *Elders of Israel*, if we (Peter and John) this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the NAME of *JESUS CHRIST of Nazareth*, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by HIM doth this man stand here before you whole. THIS is the *STONE* (ἡ λίθος) which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the *Head of the Corner*. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is NONE OTHER NAME under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Neither is there any other *Mediator*,⁴—“There is ONE GOD, and ONE

¹ John i. 42.² Acts iv. 5, 6.³ Ibid, 8—12.⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

MEDIATOR between God and Man, the *Man Christ Jesus*." Nor is there any other Foundation,¹—"For OTHER FOUNDATION can *no man lay* than that *is laid*, which is CHRIST JESUS." And, therefore,² as *the* STONE (ὁ Λίθος) which the builders rejected,"—"is become the Head of the Corner," so "whosoever shall fall on *this* STONE (ἐπὶ τὸν Λίθον τούτον) shall be broken; but on whomsoever IT shall fall, it will grind them to powder."

It is clearly seen that the *Scriptures* do not furnish us with *one single instance* of the word πέτρα, ROCK, being *applied* to PETER as the πέτρος, or *foundation stone*, of *Christ's Church* militant; but that πέτρα and Λίθος are everywhere used to *denote Christ*, and *him only*, both *before* and *since his Incarnation*, therefore, if πέτρος were meant to denote the foundation stone of Christ's Church, there would consequently be *two Rocks*, or *Stones*, or *Foundations*; for if THE CHURCH were *built* on the NAME or PERSON (rather than the FAITH) of PETER, then it would be *St. Peter's Church of Rome*, and not Christ's. It is equally clear by what subtile artifices the *name* of the *Servant* has been put for that of the MASTER, which is a direct *forgery*: for that which was only spoken in a *spiritual* sense to *Peter*, is taken in a *literal* sense by the *Sovereign Pontiffs*. When Christ told Peter that *his* ³ "*kingdom was not of this world*," but *spiritual*; then Peter believed Christ, and *preached the Gospel*. On the other hand, the *Popes* erect a *Temporal Kingdom*, and

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 11. ² Matt. xxi. 42, 44.

³ John xviii. 36.

preach, saying, that *Rome* is the *Mother Church* of *all Churches in the world*; but *ROME* is called¹ “MYSTERY—BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS,” because SEATED ON “SEVEN MOUNTAINS:” therefore, as the *Pope* claims the² “*Power of the Keys*,” as well as the NAME of PETER, we know that they are the *Keys of Earth* and the *Bottomless Pit*, and that he ranks with³ “the *Prince of this World*,” because he is NOT IN SUBJECTION to the POWERS THAT BE, as was *Peter*; but his pretensions are *above all earthly sovereignty*. We cannot but see the folly of allowing that Πέτρος and Πέτρα are *synonymous*, the results being so fatal to the spread of Christianity, as to sap the *only foundation* STONE, which is *laid in Sion*. Let us therefore take heed how we allow *things small in appearance to be given up*, or substituted; whether they be *Words, Names, Letters*, or even *Cyphers*, until we know whether they are SMALL: for the whole *Power of Papal Rome* has been *laid* upon the *Name of Peter*, viz. Πέτρος, or Κηφᾶς. May we not then, in the full assurance of Revealed Truth, take up the language of Moses, and declare to Papists, that⁴ “*Their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being Judges?*” Peter’s question, with our Lord’s answer to him, will decide that Peter was not intended by Jesus to be the Pope of the Christian Church, neither the Stone or Foundation thereof.⁵ “Then answered Peter, and said unto him, Behold,

¹ Rev. xvii. 5, and 9.² Matt. xvi. 19.³ John xii. 31; xiv. 30.⁴ Deut. xxxii. 31.⁵ Matt. xix. 27, 28. Luke xxii. 28—30.

WE have forsaken *all*, and followed THEE; what shall WE have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that YE which have followed me, in the regeneration when the *Son of Man* shall sit in the *Throne of His Glory*, YE also shall sit upon TWELVE THRONES, judging the TWELVE TRIBES of Israel."

St. John confirms the same thing in these words, ¹ "And the *wall of the City* had TWELVE FOUNDATIONS, and in them the NAMES of the TWELVE APOSTLES of the LAMB." St. John also represents the *equality of their Commission*. ² "Then said Jesus unto *them* again, Peace be unto *you*: (ἡμῖν) as my Father hath sent me, even so send I *you* (ὑμῶν). And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*, and said unto *them*, Receive *ye* the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins *ye* remit, they are remitted unto them: and whosoever sins *ye* retain, they are retained." The *sitting on Thrones* is spoken in reference to a *glorified state*, which the Apostles would receive when they had *finished their Testimony*, and entered into the *Glory of their Lord*: but the Popes, wishing to be beforehand, have taken the *Mitre of High Priesthood*, and the *Triple Crown* besides, and *sat down in the Temple of God at Rome*, as the ³ "Lords over God's heritage." Wherefore they are *Apostatès* according to the *Canon of Inspiration*, which they profess to believe.

¹ Rev. xxi. 14.

² John xx. 21—23. Matt. xviii. 18. xxviii. 16—20. Mark xvi. 15—20.

³ 1 Pet. v. 3.

IV. That the MOHAMMEDAN CHURCH, the Metropolitan of which is ST. SOPHIA at *Constantinople*, is the largest in its area of any ecclesiastical edifice in Europe, or the world, it being so spacious as to contain (as I have been credibly informed) in its vast interior 100,000 persons at one time; whereas the magnificent *Roman* (or *Papal*) BASILIQUE, called ST. PETER'S can only contain 75,000 persons. The *Mohammedan Church* (or rather *Imposture*) was nearly co-eval in its Rise with the Roman Catholic; the former commencing about July 16th, A. D. 622, and is as much an APOSTATÈS from ROMANISM, (witness the *Koran*,) as ROMANISM is from CHRISTIANITY. And because MAOMETIS is the *Name of a Man*,

$$M' = . 4 0$$

$$\alpha' = . 1$$

$$\phi' = . 7 0$$

$$\mu' = . 4 0$$

$$\varepsilon' = . . 5$$

$$\tau' = 3 0 0$$

$$i' = . 1 0$$

$$\varsigma' = 2 0 0$$

$$6 6 6$$

—who was a professed *Prophet*, and whose *Church* or *Imposture* exists at this hour, and whose *Name* when written with the foregoing Greek Letters (although I cannot admit the propriety of it being so written, because of the total *dissimilarity of the Language* from whence it is derived, viz. Arabic,)

will produce the *exact* Number 666, therefore APOSTATÈS, which is *not the Name of a Man*, cannot be a suitable appellative Name for identifying the Numbered Beast. But it is well worthy of remark, that *Constantinople* was *once the Seat of the Imperial Roman Government*, and professedly a *Christian City*, though *now Apostatès* by reason of the successive barbarous incursions of the *Saracens, Moors, Turks, and Arabs*, who have kept possession of it ever since, and have set up the KORAN in lieu of THE BIBLE. And although the *Koran* has *never been published in LATIN*, nor is it the Living Vernacular Language of *that Apostacy*, (as it is of *Mystic Rome* at the present moment); it must nevertheless be accounted as an inexplicable Mystery, that whilst the LATIN has been a Dead Language throughout the whole of Europe for several centuries, even *in Italy and Rome*, the very *Seat of the Latin, or Roman, or Italian Church and Hierarchy*, that it should be, notwithstanding this indisputable fact, the MOTHER TONGUE, the *Living Universal Language* of the CHURCH OF ROME, wheresoever her tyrannical power and influence have hitherto been extended; and she impudently professes herself to be the *original Root of the primitive Christian Church*, the *Mother Tongue of which* was GREEK, but which she has discarded by *preferring the Latin Vulgate Translation* to the GREEK ORIGINAL.

Mr. Faber, in his little volume entitled ¹ *Re-*

¹ Faber's Recapitulated Apostacy, from page 42 to 46.

capitulated Apostacy, may be consulted with advantage on the *Arabic* Name of the Impostor *Mohammed*, for one special reason which he gives— ‘ Scarcely two occidentals, except by previous concert, will express a *Hebrew* or an *Arabic* word perfectly alike in *Greek* or *Roman Letters.*’ The subjoined are the whole of his remarks on the subject.

‘ The name MAOMETIS ’ (says Mr. Faber) ‘ may rejoice in the rare felicity of having been adduced, at diverse times, both by Protestant and by Popish Expositors. Yet, even independently of the falseness of the *principle* upon which they work, we may well ask: Where is the indisputably final authority, even for writing *at all*, still less, therefore, for *exclusively* writing, the Arabic name of the impostor with the *precise* Greek Letters which compose the word MAOMETIS ?

‘ By the Popish expositor Bishop Walmesley (who clumsily fancies, however, that *his* MAOMETIS will be some *yet future* personal Turkish Antichrist assuming or bearing the name of the Arabian Impostor¹); we are told: that *The word is thus written by Euthymius and Zonaras and Cedrenus.*’²

¹ ‘ Walmesley proceeds upon the wild fancy, that we may expect a future and as yet unrevealed *personal* Antichrist, who will wear out the saints and lord it over God’s heritage during the exactly defined term of 1260 *literal* or *natural* days.’

² ‘ Walmesley’s General History of the Christian Church, chap. x. p. 320. Feuardentius, so far as I know, was the first who struck out MAOMETIS or MOAMETIS as the name of the beast. Annot. in Irenæ. page 486. But, with wise caution, he hesitates between the false prophet Mohammed and the false prophet Luther: for he finds that, provided only we write Martin Luther MARTIN LAUTER, we shall equally produce the desired number 666.

‘ Now, even if Walmesley were *accurate* in his statement: what then? *Other* historians of the later empire express the name of the prophet of Mecca in various *other* forms. Why, therefore, for the purpose of arithmetical calculation, are we *bound* to take the alleged MAOMETIS of Euthymius and Zonaras and Cedrenus, *rather than* the ΜΩΑΜΕΑ of Nicetas or the ΜΕΧΜΕΤΗΣ of Chalcocondylas, or the MAXEMET of Joannes Cantacuzenus, or the ΜΕΧΕΜΕΤ of Ducas Michael, or the ΜΩΑΜΕΘ and the ΜΑΧΟΥΜΕΤΗΣ of Joannes Cananus?’

‘ By reason of the essentially different principles of alphabetic writing which severally prevail in the East and in the West, scarcely any two occidentals, except by previous concert, will express a Hebrew or Arabic word *perfectly* alike in Greek or Roman letters. Consequently, since, down to the present day, the name of the grand impostor has been written in almost an endless *variety* of forms: those, who seek the number 666 in his name expressed in Greek letters, ought first to demonstrate, that the *particular* form MAOMETIS must, from some inherent necessity, be *critically* adopted, and that all the other forms *must*, from some inherent necessity likewise, be *critically* rejected. In fine, any person, acquainted with Hebrew or Arabic, will, from the very genius of those languages, readily perceive the utter improbability, that the enigmatical name, alluded to in the Apocalypse, should be an *Arabic* word written and numbered in *Greek* characters: because such a circumstance would make the absolute strictness of an

arithmetical calculation to depend upon the inherent laxity of an alphabetical expression.'

'Such would be the immediate objection to the word MAOMETIS, even if Bishop Walmesley had been *correct* in his allegation: but, where the interests of their church either are, or are supposed to be concerned, the assertions of the Romish Priesthood must in no wise be implicitly received. Cedrenus writes the name ΜΟΤΧΟΥΜΕΤ: Zonaras writes it ΜΩΑΜΕΘ: and Euthymius, like Zonaras, also writes it ΜΩΑΜΕΘ, or (as it appears in a manuscript of the Panoplia left by Bishop Fell to the Bodleian Library) ΜΩΑΜΕΔ. *Not one* of them writes it MAOMETIS, though Bishop Walmesley assures his wondering readers that such, with rare unanimity, is the orthography of *them all*.'

To the foregoing observations of Mr. Faber, in answer to the Romish Bishop Walmesley, we may *add another*, which is, that the TERMINATION of the *Name* Μωμετις, as written by the said Bishop, is a LATIN TERMINATION, and *not Greek*; for if it were the *latter*, it ought to be written with *ος* or *ης*, as Μωμετος or Μωμετης, and then the *one* would produce the Number 726, and the *other* 664, neither of which would correspond with the *sacred Number* 666, and this circumstance alone is sufficient to *eject* the Name Μωμετις from further use—the ORTHOGRAPHY *being spurious*.

Though MOHAMMED was a vile *Impostor*, cruel *Tyrant*, an open and *grand Enemy* to the spread of Christianity by the *blasphemous publication* of the

KORAN, and in *these* particulars, (with many others,) an ANTI-CHRIST and APOSTATE, inasmuch as he *professed* himself to be παράκλητος, the *Paraclete*, or *Comforter*, or *Holy Ghost*, and caused the KORAN to be written in *proof of his Mission*, yet HE is NOT “*the Man of Sin*” spoken of by St. Paul, nor the *Numbered Beast* of St. John : for neither the *locality of his Kingdom*, or *Throne*, are answerable to the words of St. John in reference to its being SEATED¹ on “SEVEN MOUNTAINS,” nor is the MANNER of his² “SITTING in the TEMPLE of God,” correspondent with a *pretended THEOCRACY*; nor are his *pretensions* to *Supremacy*, *Universality*, *Infallibility*, *Æcumenical Power*, commensurate with those of the LATIN PAPAL MAN.

V. and VI. That³ SOCINIANS and UNITARIANS are both of them APOSTATES from Christianity is evident, because they *profess to believe in Christ*, as a good man, and a Prophet of the highest character, and yet they *deny HIS Atonement*, the belief of which, according to “*the word of God*,” is *absolutely necessary to every Christian man’s Salvation*. To admit that a man is a good man, and not to believe that what he said of himself was strictly true, is at variance with Truth, and

¹ Rev. xvii. 9.

² 2 Thess. ii. 4.

³ For a refutation of their heterodox principles see Dr. Wardlaw’s Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. Dr Magee (late Archbishop of Dublin) on the Atonement, and Dr. Middleton, (late Bishop of Calcutta) on the Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament, edited and revised by the Rev. James Scholefield, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge.

common sense : yet *such* is the unpardonable inconsistency and persevering obstinacy of SOCINIANS and UNITARIANS. St. *John* says,¹ “HE that COMETH FROM ABOVE is *above all*. And what *he* hath *seen* and *heard*, *that* he testifieth, and no man receiveth his testimony. *He* that *hath received* HIS TESTIMONY hath SET TO HIS SEAL that *God is true* :” but *this seal, this signet* is wanting in the Socinian and Unitarian schemes, by rejecting the Atonement, and, therefore, THEY have “neither *part* nor *lot* in this matter,” for to reject the *major*, and adopt the *minor points* for which the *Son of God* was made “manifest in the flesh,” is to reject *Christ* and his *Gospel*, and to render “HIS TESTIMONY” of *none effect*. The *Jews* stand convicted upon this very ground, and their magnificent *Temple* and *City*, which were for ages, the² “*Joy of the whole Earth*,” have, for the last eighteen centuries been a “*Desolation*,” and they themselves³ “an *astonishment*, a *proverb*, and a *by-word*, among *all nations*,” for their *Apostacy*. The destruction of *Jerusalem* with its *Temple* and *Service*, and the subsequent *dispersion of the Jews*, were *foretold* by *Christ*, before they came to pass, and were all the fatal consequences of denying the *Testimony of Jesus* and his *Atonement* ; for the *Jews* said, when they crucified the “*Lord of Glory*,”⁴ “*His Blood* be on *us*, and on *our Children*,” and “*his blood*” is still on *their children*, wrath having come upon them to the

¹ John iii. 31, 32, 33.² Psalm xlviii. 2 ; Lamen. ii. 15.³ Deut. xxviii. 37.⁴ Matt. xxvii. 25.

uttermost, according to the *sign* which Jesus showed them.¹ “*Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.*” This is confirmed by *Josephus*, the Jewish historian, an *inflexible enemy to Christ and Christianity*, who says, that, 1,300,000 *Jews perished in the siege of Jerusalem*. *POLAND*, the country of *SOCINUS*, and the hot-bed of *Socinians* has drunk the cup of bitterness from the hand of the Lord, almost to the dregs, by the *instrumentality of the Russians*, even as the *Jews* did by the *instrumentality of the Romans*.

If it be a *high affront* to say of a mere man, that he does *not speak the Truth*, how much more to say of HIM, who “*spake as never man spake,*” that HIS WORD is NOT TRUTH! Such an *Impeachment* of HIM, who is TRUTH ITSELF, if it be not direct “*Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,*” I know not to what to compare it. To the woman of Samaria, Jesus testified, saying², “*I that speak unto thee am HE,*” viz. “*MESSIAS.*” To the Jews, Jesus said, “*Your father Abraham rejoiced to see MY DAY: and he saw it, and was glad. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM.*” “*No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the SON OF MAN which is in heaven.*” “*I am the Son of God.*” “*He that hath seen ME hath seen the FATHER.*” “*I and MY FATHER are ONE.*” “*I am the LIGHT*

¹ Matt. xxiv. 21.

² John iv. 26 : viii. 56, 58; iii. 13; x. 36; xiv. 9 : viii. 12; xi. 25.

of the world.” “ I am the RESURRECTION and the LIFE.” And when *adjured* by the *High Priest*, in the name of God, to say whether he were THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, he confessed that he was both.¹ “ And the *High Priest* answered and said unto him, *I adjure thee*, by the *living God*, that thou tell us whether thou be THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. Jesus saith unto him, *Thou hast said*: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the *Son of Man* sitting on the *right hand of power*, and *coming in the clouds of heaven*.” From the circumstance of the *High Priest* rending his clothes, and declaring that Jesus had² “ *spoken blasphemy*,” and from another passage of scripture we know in what sense *blasphemy* was applied to Jesus,³ “ The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for *blasphemy*; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” As Jesus proved his *divine power* and *origin*, by the *Miracles* which he performed in the presence of multitudes, and declared himself without reserve to be “ *God manifest in the flesh*,” (and this is the view which the Jews took of the matter,) so we are bound to believe that ALL he said was *true*; or *none*: for there is no *medium* in the case. Christ was the *Son of God* or he was not the *Son of God*. He was equal with his *Father*, or he was not. Those who deny his Divinity are in precisely the same case as the Jews, and the same punishment which awaited them, awaits those who take a particle from his

¹ Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.² Ibid. 64.³ John x. 33.

glory. That the word of God is true, we have strong evidence from the fact that it has been *translated* into 157 *Languages* and *Dialects* already. St. John writes thus,¹ “If we receive the witness of men, the *witness of God is greater*: for *this is the Witness of God* which *He* hath testified of his Son. He that *believeth on the Son of God*, hath the witness in himself: he that *believeth not God* hath made him a *Liar*; because he *believeth not* the *Record* that God gave of his Son. And *this is the Record*, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son*. He that *hath the Son* hath *life*; and he that *hath not the Son of God* hath *not life*.” . . . “And we know that the *Son of God* is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know HIM *that is TRUE*, and we are in HIM *that is TRUE*, even in his SON JESUS. CHRIST. THIS *is the TRUE GOD*, and *ETERNAL LIFE*.”

To adopt then a line of argument which would place *terms* and *things* which are *totally dissimilar* upon a *co-equality* is to follow the *example of Socinians* and *Unitarians*, for they *assume to themselves* the *proper Title of CHRISTIANS*, which belongs *ONLY* to those who *believe in the Atonement*. But as² “the Disciples were called *Christians* first in *Antioch*,” and not ‘*Unitarian*’ or ‘*Socinian Christians*,’ so we know from the page of Holy Writ that the terms *Unitarian* and *Socinian* are *superfluous*, and only brand them with *Apostacy*. And because *THEY deny the Atonement*, therefore “*their Rock*

¹ 1 John v. 9—12, 20.

² Acts xi. 26.

is not as *our Rock*, even our enemies themselves being judges :” for *their speech* is to the ear of a *Christian* what the¹ “ *speech of Ashdod*” was to the ear of *Nehemiah*, and as *easily to be distinguished*. And, consequently, to attempt the *identification* of such ‘ *counter-elements*,’ as these, without Reason or Precedent, is to introduce *uncertainty* into every thing, by nullifying the established laws of Order in *Language*, *Orthography*, and the *plainest Scripture Truths*.

It is still further manifest, that *Apostatès*, which is *not the proper name of a Man*, cannot, for the same reason, be the *proper* or *Appellative Name* of the *numbered Beast* whose Name is declared by St. John to be that of a MAN, and to contain the precise Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666 ; since *Apostatès* is *too indefinite* an appellation for the Beast, it does *not contain the Number 666*, and can *never be converted into*, or *substituted for the Name of a Man*, and, therefore, must be rejected, as the most useless, because the *most inconclusive* of all *pretended Names*. For example—If we were to speak of the *Emperor JULIAN* who is proverbially and emphatically styled *THE APOSTATE*, yet it would be necessary to use the *Name—Julian*—because it is the *Proper Name of this Man* ; for were we to *omit his Name*, no one would of a certainty conclude that *Julian the Apostate* was meant ; but probably *Antiochus Epiphanès* might be intended, or *Absalom*, or *Ahithophel*, or *Rehoboam*, all of whom were in their turns *Apos-*

¹ Nehem. xiii. 24.

tates from “ *the Commonwealth of Israel* ;” or per-
 adventure *Judas Iscariot*, who is emphatically called
 “ *The Son of Perdition*,” and therefore *Apostate*,
 because he betrayed Christ and perished in his
 Αποστασία τῆς Πίστεως. Not of necessity, therefore, should
 THE POPES OF ROME be conjectured from the mere
 indefinite Appellation of APOSTATÈS, which is appli-
 cable to *other Churches* and *other Individuals*, and
 which is totally inapplicable to the *Name of any*
Man ; for the POPES have severally and successively
 their *proper Names* as *Men*, as well as the *Titles*
 which are given them by way of *Distinction* and
Eminence upon their ELECTION and *establishment on*
the PAPAL THRONE, even as the *Apostate Julian*
 had ; and, therefore, on this additional ground of
 objection *Apostatès* will not serve the purpose in-
 tended by Mr. Faber.

As we have already noticed several leading *Apos-
 tacies* from *Christianity*, ex. gr. the *Jewish*, *Greek*,
Latin, *Mohammedan*, *Socinian*, *Unitarian*, together
 with sundry examples of *Civil* and *National Apos-
 tates* : how shall we be able to prove that the chief
 burden of APOSTACY ought *primarily*, *appellatively*,
 and *summarily* to be laid upon the *Latin Church*
 of ROME, so as to distinguish HER by *Character* and
Name as she ought to be distinguished from ALL
other Apostatès ? I would answer, *not* by means
 of the word *Apostatès*, but by adhering in the
 strictest manner to the “ *wisdom*” and “ *under-
 standing*” of which *St. John* speaks, which is, in
 the given Greek Number χξς’ (or 666) to find the

NAME of a MAN written *in Greek Letters*, which will produce by Greek *Alphabetical Numeration* or Computation the appropriate "*Mark*," appellative "*Name*," and enigmatical "*Number 666*" of the Beast; and having thus discovered the *Name of a Man*, (written in Greek characters,) then we must apply it to the Rule laid down by St. John, which is this,¹ "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding COUNT THE NUMBER of *the Beast*;" that is to say, "The NAME of the Beast, or the NUMBER of his NAME," which is the "NUMBER of a MAN; and *his Number is Six Hundred Threescore and Six*." And by following *this Rule*, after the example of *Irenæus*, the result will be manifest. To which end we must have resort to *the original Greek Text of the New Testament*, the testimony of the early Fathers, of ancient Greek Grammarians, Lexicographers, and Classical Writers; and the opinions of the most learned and pious men, as corroborating the whole; whereby we shall prove, in the clearest and most indisputable manner that the very ancient name ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ, (Lateinos,) as used by *Irenæus* in the *Second Century*, is in truth the *Name of a Man*, which contains the exact Number 666, and is applicable in every particular to the character of the *Numbered Beast* as described by St. John. Moreover, we shall find that the ancient use of the *Diphthong*, or broad δ or $\epsilon\iota$ in Λατδνος or Λατ $\epsilon\iota$ νος was perfectly correct in regard to orthography, and also the truth of the conjectures

¹ Rev. xiii. 17, 18.

of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* (concerning the LATIN or ROMAN *Ecclesiastical Power* made by them some centuries before the EVENTS came to pass) will be evident. For, after the *division of the old Empire* into *Ten Kingdoms*, and the subsequent *Rise, Progress, and Establishment* of the *Papal Dominion* had brought to light the truth of a *hidden Mystery*, viz. that *the Papacy* after its establishment was *found* SEATED in the *old IMPERIAL CITY OF ROME*; had *adopted* the *Pagan Cæsarean Title* of 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS;' had *retained its ancient LATIN Language*, with its *Pagan sacrificial Rites and ceremonies, modified to a professed Christian Standard*, and finally *claimed UNIVERSAL POWER and DOMINION*, both SPIRITUAL and SECULAR, and thereby EVIDENCED ITSELF to the WHOLE WORLD to be the GREAT ANTICHRISTIAN POWER, or in the words of Scripture, 'THE ANTICHRIST,' 'THE MAN OF SIN,' 'THE SON OF PERDITION,' 'THE WICKED ONE;' then that which was *Prophesied* by St. *John* and St. *Paul*, *conjectured* by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, was *confirmed* by succeeding EVENTS to which the whole current of Ecclesiastical History bears ample testimony.

It must be evident, from what has been already advanced respecting the *word* (not Name) APOSTATÈS, that it does *not contain* in the INDIVIDUAL LETTERS of that *word* the *true Number* 666, or χξς', but rather 1160, which is 494 *more* than the number mentioned by St. *John*; neither is it an appropriate word in any rendering of it; for it is as much *too*

general a Term whereby to express the Proper and Appellative name of the Beast, as the word *Catholic* is *too universal a Term* whereby to identify the *Roman Catholic*, or *LATIN Church*; for the *Term CATHOLIC* is an *UNIVERSAL TERM*, but the *adjective ROMAN* is a *PARTICULAR Term*, and distinguishes it from the *Jewish, Greek, Christian, Mohammedan*, and all other *real or professed Churches* in the world, and by which peculiar *LATIN 'Mark or Name'* we know, to a demonstration, that the *LATIN Church of Rome* is neither the *Original*, nor *True*, nor *Universal Church*; but *only UNIVERSAL* as it respects the *mystical use and inexplicable Retention* of the *LATIN Language*, which is *ALL* that we want for our argument in favour of the *Name Λατῆνιος, Lateinos*. If the *Roman Catholic* were the *true Christian Church*, (as she impudently professes herself to be,) then, the *Term Catholic*, being an *universal term*, would suffice to express the whole *Christian Church* to the utmost limits of the globe; but the *adjective ROMAN* ('*Sacra ROMANA Ecclesia*,'—'*Sanctum ROMANUM Imperium*') being annexed, we have at once both the *Identity and self-prescribed LIMITS* of the *Roman or LATIN Papal Church and Kingdom*, founded upon the ruins of the ancient city and empire of *Imperial Rome*, which persecuted the *Apostles and Primitive Christians* under the tyrannical reigns of the *Emperors Nero, &c.* but *where, in the days of St. Paul*, there was a *Christian Church* of which ¹*LINUS* was appointed the *first*

¹ *IRENEUS*, Lib. iii. cap. 3. and *EUSEBIUS*, Lib. iii. Hist. Eccles. cap. 2.

Bishop, ANACLET the *second*, and CLEMENT the *third*. Moreover, as the GREEK (not *Latin*) was the *Mother Tongue* of the *true Catholic* and *Apostolic Church*, why has it not continued such, if indeed some ONE *particular Language* must needs be retained on account of *Church Unity*, &c. ? The *Greek*, which is the *original Language* of the *New Testament*, has been most impiously laid aside by Papal craft and authority, and has been supplanted (without the least shadow of a command in Holy Scripture for such substitution) by the LATIN Vulgate Version or translation, of which there have been SEVEN revised and amended Papal editions, and between the *two editions* of Pope ²SIXTUS the Vth. and CLEMENT the VIIIth. there are about 2000 different Readings: and not only has the LATIN Version been substituted for the *Greek original*, but it has literally *superseded* the *Vernacular* or *Vulgar Tongue of Modern Rome* and *Italy*, which is ITALIAN.

Let, therefore, the POPE of ROME glory in his LATIN-Ecclesiastical *Universality, Dominion, and Power*; for by HOW MUCH HE hath the GREATER AUTHORITY, by SO MUCH *surer argument* is HE that LATIN BEAST or MAN, whose *proper* and *Appellative NAME* is Λατῆινος, and HIS *enigmatical Number* χξζ', or εξακοσιοι εξηκοντα ἕξ, or 666.

¹ See James's 'Bellum Papale,' &c. London, 1678.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTAINING A REFUTATION OF DR. ADAM CLARKE'S
HYPOTHESIS OF

Η ΛΑΤΙΝΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ.

HAVING now fully discussed the demerits of Mr. Faber's favourite word *Αποστατης*, *Apostatès*, as neither *contractedly* nor *uncontractedly* containing the *true Number* *χξς'*, or 666, nor the *name of any Man*—and having also established that the numerical *επισημον* *Ψav*, or *cypher* *ς'*, which has been brought forward by Mr. Faber to *represent* the *contraction* of *σ* and *τ* (*ς*) is *spurious orthography*,—and finally, that the *word Apostatès* itself contains no sufficiently *definite signification*,—I gladly leave both the *Theory* and the *Theorist*, and proceed to consider—

II. The Hypothesis of the learned Dr. Adam Clarke, concerning the Number *χξς'*, which he affirms to be—

Η ΛΑΤΙΝΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ,¹ THE LATIN KINGDOM.

¹ See Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on Rev. xiii. 18.

This opinion of the learned Doctor (against the *orthography* of *Λατῆινος*) will soon be seen to stand on very slender ground, though backed by *much learning* and ingenuity, and the *aid of Cardinal Bellarmine*. To this end it will only be necessary to *contrast*, or bring in opposition the *words of the Apostle John* with *those of Dr. Clarke*, to see how well they agree. St. John says, ¹ “THE NAME of the Beast, or the Number of HIS NAME.” “Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding COUNT THE NUMBER of the beast: for it is THE NUMBER of a MAN; and HIS NUMBER is *Six hundred threescore and Six*,” or “666.” whereas the “*wisdom*” and “*understanding*” evinced by the learned Dr. Clarke is to the following effect, “The Name of the Beast, or the Number of his Name.” Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the Number of the Beast; for it is the NUMBER of THE LATIN KINGDOM; “and *his number*,” (i. e. of the LATIN KINGDOM) is “*Six hundred Threescore and Six*.” Now then, it must be evident to all reasonable men that the NUMBER OF A KINGDOM and “the NUMBER OF A MAN” can never be construed to mean the same thing, unless it can *first* be proved that MAN and KINGDOM are *synonymous terms*, which is impossible, and, therefore, whatever amount of learning, talent, and ingenuity has been displayed by the Doctor on this subject, it is nevertheless wholly irrelevant to the *subject proposed* for our consideration by St. John,

¹ Rev. xiii. 17, 18.

which is from the given Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, to find *the NAME of a MAN*, written in *Greek characters*, answerable to the Number 666; and not only must the *Name of the Man* contain the precise given number, but it must likewise portray the *general and particular character of such a MAN* as is described in the xiiith Chapter of the Revelations from ver. 11 to ver. 18, inclusive. And however nearly Dr. Clarke may have arrived in idea at the given Number from the sentence ἡ Λατινὴ βασιλεία, '*The Latin Kingdom*,' yet from the simple *Facts* that *this sentence* does *not denote the Name of a MAN*, and that there is *another sentence of similar and equal importance*, which contains the *same number 666*, viz. Ἐκκλησία Ἰταλικά, ITALIAN CHURCH; the Doctor's hypothesis is more fanciful than real, and must of necessity be disputed, as we shall proceed to demonstrate. For *if* the sentence ἡ Λατινὴ βασιλεία, THE LATIN KINGDOM will produce the Number of the Beast, *so also the sentence* Ἐκκλησία Ἰταλικά, ITALIAN CHURCH will produce the *same number*: but as *neither of them contains the Name of a Man*, so they must *both be rejected*, not on account of the Number, which is correct, but because they are *inapplicable*.

	E' = ..5		η' = ..8
	κ' = .20		Λ' = .30
	κ' = .20		α' = ..1
	λ' = .30		τ' = 300
	η' = ..8	THE	ι' = .10
	σ' = 200		ν' = .50
ITALIAN	ι' = .10	LATIN	η' = ..8
	α' = ..1		β' = ..2
	ι' = .10	KING-	α' = ..1
CHURCH.	τ' = 300		σ' = 200
	α' = ..1		ι' = .10
	λ' = .30	DOM.	λ' = .30
	ι' = .10		ε' = ..5
	κ' = .20		ι' = .10
	α' = ..1		α' = ..1
	<hr/> 666 <hr/>		<hr/> 666 <hr/>

As¹ *Piscator, Brightman, and others*, have given us the sentence ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ Ιταλικά, ITALIAN CHURCH, which will produce the Number 666 in a legitimate manner; what advantage has the learned Dr. Adam Clarke derived by the adoption of the sentence η Λατινή βασιλεια—THE LATIN KINGDOM? for it is evident that both, 'THE LATIN KINGDOM' and 'ITALIAN CHURCH,' when written in GREEK LETTERS will severally produce the same Number 666, yet as neither of these sentences can exhibit the Name of

¹ Piscatoris Commentarii Novi Testamenti. Scholia in cap. xiii. Apocalypsis Johannis, ver. 18, p. 1549. Ed. Herbornæ Nassoviorum, 1613. Brightman on Rev. xiii. 18. Amsterdam 1611.

a *Man*, they cannot properly be said to represent the *Number of a Man*, but are both spurious: because St. John says most plainly that, “the *NAME of the Beast*,” “is the *Number of a MAN* ;” now the words ‘*KINGDOM*,’ or ‘*CHURCH*,’ or ‘*APOSTATÈS*,’ are none of them the *Names of Men*, and as the *WORD OF GOD is to be our GUIDE to the interpretation of the sacred numerical enigma*, and not the learning of *Dr. Clarke*, or *Mr. Faber* simply considered, therefore, their authority must bow in submission to that *SUPREME authority*, as being the *infallible guide to*, and *Fountain of all revealed Truth*. And although neither ‘*The Latin Kingdom*,’ nor ‘*Italian Church*,’ are suitable sentences to prove the point at issue, yet I must confess that *Dr. Adam Clarke* has used much greater fairness than *Mr. Faber*, in his search after the Number 666, in the sentence η Λατινη βασιλεια, inasmuch as the Doctor has strictly confined himself to the well known numerical use of the 24 Greek Letters, without running wild after an *episèmon* to prove it equal to the contraction of two Letters; it is however abundantly certain that the Doctor’s argument cannot be sound, although the said sentence may be considered in a comparative point of view, as strengthening the long existing arguments against *Romanists* or *Papists*, but not more so than the sentence Εκκλησια Ιταλικά, ‘*Italian Church*,’ which is more appropriate for the *Papacy*. Yet after all I feel satisfied (yea, I might say positive) that the only one proper and Appellative Name of a MAN, which, when written in Greek Letters, can

furnish us with the precise arithmetical '*Number*,' appropriate '*Mark*,' and appellative '*Name*' of the number Beast, is Λατῆινος, *Lateinos*, the *orthography* of which is *proved to be correct*, and to be in *every other respect* answerable to the *general scope of the Prophecies* of *St. John* and *St. Paul*; being the *Proper Name of a Man*, namely, ¹ *LATINUS*, who was *King of Latium* or *Italy*, and the *founder of the ancient Kingdom of the Latins*, called after *his Name, Latium*, (and afterwards *Rome*,) whence comes the *Latin NAME, Race, and Language*, which was formerly spoken throughout all Europe; and more Proof than this is not necessary in any argument. It is absolutely indispensable that the *Name of the Man* should in *all particulars* identify the character of the *second Beast* (as the true *Image of the First*,) who is an acknowledged ² *Ecclesiastical Superior* of the *very Highest Order and Degree*—the *pseudo-Christian* '*PONTIFEX MAXIMUS*' even the *Man of the Latin, or Roman, or Italian Church and Kingdom*, who ³ "*SITTETH*" (according to prediction) "*in the Temple of God*" (at Rome) "*shewing himself that HE is God*;" of ancient *Roman Idolatries*, of *Heathen Mythology*, impudently introduced into the Church under *Christian names*; that He is the *God-Man of Romanists*—their *Idol*, their *Image*, their *Pope, Papa, or Father*; that He is the ecclesiastical founder of modern Hierarchical Rome with its present Papistical

¹ Virgil. *Æneid*. Lib. vii. line 45. *ibid.* Lib. I. line 6.

² Rev. xiii. 11.

³ 2 Thess. ii. 4.

form of Government, *a similar form to which has never before existed in the known world.* That He, therefore, is “*the Man of Sin,*” “*The Son of Perdition,*” “*The wicked one,*” spoken of by St. Paul, *The Antichrist* of St. John, and the very MAN, whose enigmatical Number is $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or “*Six hundred threescore and six.*” And, therefore, notwithstanding the number of profound Greek authors who have been quoted by Dr. Adam Clarke with an intent to nullify the orthography of Irenæus in his use of the DIPHTHONG or broad $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\dot{\iota}$ in the Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, he has utterly failed. The learning of Cardinal Bellarmine moreover has been added to the List of his authorities:—‘*Bellarmino the Jesuit* (as the Doctor writes) *objected* against $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ being the Name intended in the prophecy from its orthography; for, says he, it should be written $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$. That the objection of the learned Jesuit has very great force, is evident from every Greek writer extant, who has used the Greek word *Latinus*, in all of whom it is uniformly found without the diphthong. See *Hesiod, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Plutarch, Dio Cassius, Photius, the Byzantine historians, &c.*’

From this array of *ancient classical authors*, supported by *Bellarmino*, it would appear, at first sight, morally impossible to advance any thing further towards establishing the name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; but the question at issue is *not* whether *any of the before named Authors* have ever used the diphthong or broad $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\dot{\iota}$ when writing the Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; but whether such

orthography was *acknowledged as legitimate* among the ANCIENT GREEKS and ANCIENT ROMANS in NAMES of MEN, &c. ? That it was both *customary* and *legitimate* to use the *Diphthong* or broad *ei* or *ɛ* can be *proved* by a number of the most indisputable ancient authorities. Therefore it matters not in the least whether any such authors as those named by Dr. Clarke have ever used the *Diphthong* or not. The *simple fact* to be established is, whether *such orthography* was considered *genuine* in the *time of Irenæus* ; and, if it ever was legitimate, we may suppose it probable in his Days, because he has unhesitatingly used the *diphthong*, or broad *ei*, or *ɛ* in two several NAMES out of THREE, pertaining to the same number ‘ 666,’ viz. Λατῆινος and Τέιταν, and as IRENÆUS (the *beginning* of whose name is written by Eusebius with the Diphthong *ei*, Εἰρηναῖος,) was one of the Christian Fathers, and wrote professedly “ *Contra omnes Hæreses*,” it would seem a gross inconsistency for him to *select Two Names* out of *Three*, the *orthography* of which was *disputable*. It will be therefore my grand object to bring forward such *ancient authorities* under the head of the *Diphthong ei* vel *ɛ* as shall establish the COMMON USE of the *broad ei* or *ɛ* beyond all further doubt or controversy: for that which the *Ancients used*, and which can be proved incontrovertibly from many *classical Authors* extant, from *Lexicons*, from *Medals*, &c. cannot be set aside by modern Commentators, let their learning be ever so great. When Dr. Clarke and others have proved that the authorities

produced in favour of the *Diphthong* or *broad* d or $\epsilon\iota$ are *not sufficient*, nay even *abundant*, to establish the *ancient uses of the Diphthong* in the name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, it will be time enough to give up the Point; *till then*, I shall consider myself fully justified in vindicating the *Orthography of Irenæus* in the ancient classical use of the *epsilon* (ϵ) with the *iota* (ι) as $\epsilon\iota$ or d , or the *iota circumflexed* as $\hat{\iota}$, (which latter is *generally*, if not always, *equivalent to a Diphthong*,) against the various *pseudo-opinions* of *Dr. Adam Clarke*, *Mr. Faber*, *Cardinal Bellarmine*, *Grotius*, and a host of other writers. That *Dr. Clarke* should have *selected Cardinal Bellarmine*, the most *subtle of all Jesuits* in the world, the very mouth piece of the POPE OF ROME, with the intent to *nullify the orthography of Irenæus* in the use of the ϵ in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, is most astonishing, (much more so indeed than that Professor Lee of Cambridge should have chosen the subtle demi-papistical Archbishop Laud, with a view to set aside the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, by confronting it with the *spurious* Number $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616). Because *Bellarmino* had a *special self-interest* to support at Rome, as *Cardinal Secretary of State to the Pope*, in which he could not more effectually serve '*His Holiness*,' and the whole '*Church of Rome*,' than by endeavouring to set aside the orthography of *Irenæus* on THIS POINT; for this *Arch-Jesuit* had most assuredly found out that *if the orthography of this all-important Name* $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ were ONCE established BEYOND CONTROVERSY, the *consequences* would be that

IT could *apply* to NONE OTHER CHURCH *in the world* than *his own* LATIN CHURCH and *usurped* HIERARCHY, and that it would, according to prediction, *lead to its downfall*. Bellarmine, therefore, could not be looked upon as a *disinterested Man*, especially when it is duly considered that the LATIN or *Roman Church* claims to herself, *universality*, and will admit of *no ecclesiastical Rival or Superior*; for, what is said by *Papists* of the *Church of St. John Lateran at Rome*, is equally said of the *Pope at his Installation and Coronation*—"Omnium in Urbe atque in Orbe Ecclesiarum Mater atque Caput." *Of all Churches in the City and the World—The Mother and the Head*; so upon the *Papal Coronation* are these presumptuous *Titles of Blasphemy* conferred—"Accipe Tiaram, tribus coronis ornatum, et scias TE esse Patrem Principum et Regum, Rectorem Orbis, in Terrâ Vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi: cui Honor est, et Gloria in Sæcula Sæculorum. Amen." 'Receive *Thou the Tiara*, adorned with *THREE CROWNS*, and *KNOW THYSELF to be FATHER of PRINCES and of KINGS, RULER of THE WORLD, upon Earth Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ: to whom be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. Amen.*'

It is evident to me that *Irenæus* never doubted for one moment the integrity of the *orthography* of the Name *Αατῆινος*, because he has made use of a *second Name* *Τεῖταν*, *TEITAN*, which is liable to the same *orthographical objection* respecting the *Dipthong* *δ* or *ει*, and were there no other authorities extant to

prove the *use of the Diphthong* d in his day, the *double use of it by a Christian Father* ought to carry more weight than any thing which *Dr. Clarke, Mr. Faber, Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius*, or other writers of a *recent date* can advance to the contrary. The *Field*, however, will be *left to them no longer*, but it will be *proved beyond all doubt* that *Irenæus* was not only a *much better Grammarian than they*, but also that he came so much nearer to the true Name of the Man, as to have *literally furnished us with it*. “*LATEINOS nomen habet Sexentorum Sexaginta sex numerum : et valde verisimile est, quoniam, novissimum Regnum HOC HABET VOCABULUM.*” And the Reason why we know of a certainty that *his conjecture* was *true*, is this, that “*LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC Regnant.*” *For THEY are ‘LATINS (i. e. Papists,) who NOW Reign.’*

And although *Dr. Clarke* has declaimed so much against the *orthography of Irenæus*, with regard to his *use of the diphthong* in the name Λατῆνως , the *Doctor* has nevertheless noticed *three things* relative to the *Number “666”* which are worthy of observation, because they tend greatly to strengthen my own opinion.

1st. That it is the *GREEK LANGUAGE* from which the *Name of the Beast* must be elicited, as he says, “*Having shown that it was a practice in the Apostolic age, and subsequently, to count the number in words and phrases, and even in whole verses, it will be evident that what is intended by 666, is that the GREEK NAME of the Beast, (for it was in the Greek*

Language that Jesus Christ communicated his Revelation to St. John,) contains this Number."

The 2nd point worthy of observation is, the *very high Terms* in which the *Doctor* speaks of the *Name* $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and of *Irenæus* its Author, or setter forth.

"Many NAMES," says the Doctor, "have been proposed, from time to time, as applicable to the Beast, and at the same time containing 666. We will only notice ONE example, that *famous* ONE of Irenæus, which has been *approved by almost all commentators who have given any sort of tolerable exposition of the Revelation*. The word alluded to is $\Lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, the LETTERS of which have the following numerical values. $\Lambda = 30$. $\alpha = 1$. $\tau = 300$. $\epsilon = 5$. $\iota = 10$. $\nu = 50$. $\sigma = 70$. $s = 200$; and if these be added together, the sum will be found to be equivalent to the Number of the Beast. This word was applied by Irenæus, who lived in the second Century, to the existing Roman Empire; for, says he, "*They are LATINS who now reign.*"

The 3rd particular which the Doctor notices, is the sentence $\eta\ \Lambda\alpha\tau\iota\nu\eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$, 'THE LATIN KINGDOM.' His observations are as follow:

'No other Kingdom on Earth can be found to contain 666. This is then the $\eta\ \sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$, "the wisdom, or demonstration." The Doctor continues. "A Beast is the symbol of a Kingdom; THE Beast has been *proved*, in the preceding part of this Chapter, to be the LATIN Kingdom; and $\eta\ \Lambda\alpha\tau\iota\nu\eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$, being shown to contain, *exclusively*, the Number 666, is the *demonstration.*"

On the two former observations of the Doctor, we are pretty well agreed ; but respecting his *third* remark I must be allowed to differ from him ; for if it can be proved—that “ *No other Kingdom on Earth can be found to contain 666 ;*” and that “ *A Beast is the symbol of Kingdom :* yet the ἡ σφραῖς of St. John is not to find “ *the Symbol of a Kingdom :*” BUT “ *the Number of a MAN,*” which must *imply his Name*, and therefore St. John tells us in the 17th verse of the xiiith chap. that “ *the NAME of the Beast, or the NUMBER of his NAME,*” must be sought after and then counted ; and as I have already shown that MAN and KINGDOM are NOT *synonymous terms*, and that the sentence ἐκκλησία Ἰταλικά, ‘ *ITALIAN CHURCH,*’ will produce the *same number* as the sentence ἡ Λατίνη βασιλεῖα ‘ *THE LATIN KINGDOM,*’ therefore ‘ *The Latin Kingdom*’ and ‘ *Italian Church*’ must both of them give place to the *Proper name of the Man of Latium or Rome*, viz. Λατῆινος (LATINUS) of which it may with *much greater propriety* be affirmed that ‘ *No other Name of a Man on Earth can be found suitable to, and illustrative of the Roman Papal Beast* but Λατῆινος ; because it contains the *true Number 666*, and is fully answerable to the *general scope of the Prophecy*. And, although, Dr. Clarke has quoted Cardinal Bellarmine, and eight classical Authors against the orthography of Λατῆινος, namely, Hesiod, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Plutarch, Dio Cassius, Photius, the Byzantine Historians, &c. &c. : yet I will pledge myself to confront these with many more authorities

of *equal antiquity* and celebrity for the *ancient use of the diphthong* ϕ or $\epsilon\iota$, and what then can be said after the production of such numerous authorities? Why, they must necessarily cause a *surrender* of Dr. Clarke's hypothesis, because the question to be decided is not (as we have before remarked) whether the *epsilon* (ϵ) is to be *found* in any of the *eight before mentioned Authors* when writing the *Name* $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, but whether it was considered *sound orthography in the time of Irenæus*, who lived in the *2nd Century*, and whether it was *THEN legitimate to write the Diphthong or broad* ϕ or $\epsilon\iota$. [See the Authorities for such uses, Chapter XV.]

It is evident, therefore, that Dr. Clarke, without taking the trouble to investigate the *merits of the Diphthong, broad or circumflex*, ι , $\epsilon\iota$, or ϕ , in the *Name* which may be written in any of the three following ways, as $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\Lambda\alpha\tau\text{ϕ}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\Lambda\alpha\tau\text{ι}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, has tacitly, and I might say ignorantly, *ceded the palm* TO CARDINAL BELLARMINE, and thereby *lost the most answerable NAME* EXTANT, concerning the *Number 666*, agreeably to the Doctor's own observation. 'Many NAMES,' says he, 'have been proposed from time to time, as applicable to the beast, and at the same time containing 666. We will only notice that ONE example, viz. that *famous ONE* of Irenæus, which has been *approved of by almost all commentators who have given any sort of tolerable exposition of the Revelation*. The word alluded to is $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$,' &c. However I doubt not that what has been already advanced concerning the ortho-

graphy of Irenæus, in reference to the *Diphthong* in the Name *Λατῆivos* can never be overthrown by any *Classical writers*, and if this Name of *Λατῆivos* were FAMOUS in times past, it will be still MORE FAMOUS for THE TIME TO COME. I am free to confess, that, although there are multitudes of men more competent than myself to undertake this elucidation, yet from the *sophistry* which has been displayed by so many learned and pious Authors, I felt most anxious, if possible, to arrive at the CERTAINTY both of the NAME of the MAN, and the NUMBER of his NAME, the latter of which has been impeached by Professor Lee and Archbishop Laud, and the former has been misconceived by many writers. Of one thing I can assure my Readers, that, since the year 1829, I have used much patient investigation in my endeavours to establish the *Mystic Name*; and that the *Motive* which prompts me to the publication of this little work is a love of and zeal for the elucidation and final establishment of TRUTH, which is evidently the self-same *Motive* which moved Irenæus to write on this *Sacred Number* *χξς'*, or "666," as he says, *Propter timorem erga Deum, et ZELUM VERITATIS*.

As it is truly painful to see so many gigantic Authors at a polar distance in their opinions on this subject, it seems expedient as far as practicable, to arrest the progress of so many glaring errors as must spring out of such a discrepancy.

CHAPTER XIII.

REMARKS ON THE SPURIOUS NUMBER $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, OR 616,
WHICH IS MENTIONED BY PROFESSOR LEE.

HAVING proved, as I believe, the fallacy of Dr. Adam Clarke's hypothesis with reference to the sentence *η Λατινη βασιλεια*, as also of the *similar sentence* *Εκκλησιαι Ιταλικα*, I now proceed to notice,

III. The opinion of *Professor Lee*¹ of Cambridge, which is, that the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666 is disputable, for the Regius Professor of Hebrew informs us that, “ In the times of Irenæus *another Number*, viz. $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616, was also found, which is sufficient to shew, that liberties had been taken with this passage: and I cannot help adding the words of Archbishop Laud: ‘ Numeralis illa theologia—non mihi placet—non sapit spiritum apostolicum.’ ”

I believe, however, that all New Testament commentators upon this Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, are fully

¹ Lee's Dissertations on Prophecy. Rev. xiii. Diss. II. Sec. III. Page 329.

agreed concerning its *authenticity* and *integrity* ; even *Cardinal Bellarmine*, the *Jesuit*, who *objects* to the *orthography* of *Irenæus*, in his use of the *Diphthong* ϝ , in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\text{ϝ}\nu\sigma$ does *not object* to the NUMBER $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, and, therefore, should it be still *further* objected that not only was the *orthography* of *Irenæus* incorrect respecting the *diphthong* ϝ , but that a doubt exists about the *correctness* and *validity* of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, as *Professor Lee* has insinuated in his “ *Dissertations on Prophecy*,” then it will be proper to examine the force of such objection in order to ascertain whether it can stand the Test of critical investigation ; and if it cannot, *it must be rejected* as irrelevant and inconclusive.

In replying to the above sentiments of *Professor Lee* concerning the pseudo-prophetic Number $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616, backed by the equivocal opinion of *Archbishop Laud*, I will endeavour to shew from the genuine words of *Irenæus*, that this solitary rival of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, was never sanctioned by that Christian Father, but originated with some author (most likely contemporary,) whose writings were never considered equally orthodox with those of *Irenæus*, otherwise the Professor of Hebrew would not have failed to have given us *his Name*, the precise time when he wrote, and when this Number first made its appearance. For although the Professor has not hesitated to remark—that, “ In the times of *Irenæus* another number, viz. $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616, was also found, which is *sufficient* to shew, that *LIBERTIES* had been taken with *this Passage* ;” yet he cannot suppose

that we are to *infer* from the expression, '*The Times of Irenæus*,' that IRENÆUS *ever favoured such an opinion*; for the production of his *own three Names* Τεῖταν, Λατῆινος, and Ευανθας, as well as his *reasoning on the subject*, are totally subversive of such an idea, because *each one of these Names contains the precise Number 666*. As to the statement that this Number 616, $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, is 'SUFFICIENT to shew, that *liberties* had been taken with this passage;' it can only prove that ONE *liberty* had been taken with it, and this is the very *utmost* that the Professor can produce, or he need not have resorted to the *dubious opinion of Archbishop Laud*, who merely says, 'Numeralis illa theologia . . . non MIHI placet;' as people generally express themselves, when they do not understand any particular subject—'non mihi placet,' '*it does not please me*;' and as for the Archbishop's *assertion*—'non sapit spiritum Apostolicum,' it seems to me altogether to want *proof*. It is evident from the simple circumstance that the Professor has used the *term* 'LIBERTIES,' that HE *is not satisfied* with the ORIGINALITY and *authenticity* of the Number $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616, or why does the Professor say, '*liberties*?' We may infer, therefore, from the *off-hand words* of Archbishop Laud, 'Numeralis illa theologia . . . non MIHI placet . . . non sapit spiritum Apostolicum,' that they no more sanction the rejection of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, than the authority of Cardinal Bellarmine, quoted by Dr. Adam Clarke, (and a worse could scarcely have been adduced,) can operate to the rejection of the

ε in the Name *Λατῆινος*. And this I say because of the Cardinal's attachment to the LATIN or *Roman Church*, and that HE has been *proved not* to be so good a *Grammarian* or *Antiquarian* as IRENEUS.

Professor Lee's observations on the Number χις', or 616, were, I presume, induced by his Theory concerning the *Completion of the whole Prophecy of the Book of Revelation*, thus given in the *Title Page* to his '*Dissertations on Prophecy*.'

'The second (DISSERTATION) on the interpretation of Prophecy Generally, with an Original Exposition of THE BOOK of REVELATION; shewing that the WHOLE of that remarkable Prophecy has LONG AGO BEEN FULFILLED.' Now, with deference to the Professor, I would remark, that the ROMAN or LATIN PAPAL CHURCH, which is a *Principal Subject* of that Prophecy is still in existence, as also the MOHAMMEDAN CHURCH, or *Imposture*, which is *another subject* of the same Prophecy, that is, '*The Beast*,' and '*The false Prophet*,' and while these two great *Antichristian Churches continue*, it cannot be *literally* or *figuratively* said, that ¹ "BABYLON is fallen, is fallen, that GREAT CITY." And the Reason why it cannot be so said is, that the predicted *Antecedent* to the EVENT has *not yet fully come to pass*, namely, ² "I saw another Angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to Preach unto them that dwell on the EARTH, and to EVERY NATION, and

¹ Rev. xiv. 8.

² Rev. xiv. 6.

KINDRED, and TONGUE, and PEOPLE.” And as the *everlasting Gospel* had been in the *first* instance “preached in all the world for the *obedience of Faith*,” BEFORE the Time that *St. John’s Revelation* was generally known, we may conclude that *these grand Events* belong NOT to ¹“*the things which ARE* ;” (or *happened in St. John’s time* ;) but to *that epoch of his Vision* which relates to ¹“*the things which shall be HEREAFTER*.” Besides which the JEWS have *not* been *nationally converted to Christianity* ; neither has ²“*Ethiopia* stretched forth her hands unto God ;” nor is the ³“*EARTH* filled with the *Knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea*.” And, therefore, the WHOLE of *that remarkable prophecy* CANNOT, in its fullest extent, have been FULFILLED. See Rom. xi. 12, 15, 23, 25, 26, &c.

As Irenæus himself has set forth *three* several Names, viz. *Ευανθας*, *Λατῆινος*, and *Τεῖταν*, each of which contains the *precise Number* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, *nothing can be advanced from the writings of this ancient Greek Father, in favour of the Number* $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, or 616, so as to make it worthy of the least credence ; because *Irenæus* wrote professedly *against all Heresies*,—and was contemporary with *Polycarp*, who was the *Disciple of St. John*. It would therefore be folly to allow this Christian Father, after the unequivocal declaration he has made, ⁴“*Sed scientes FIRMUM NUMERUM qui à SCRIPTURA annuntiatus est, id est,*

¹ Rev. i. 19.² Psalm lxviii. 31.³ Hab. ii. 14. Isaiah xi. 9.⁴ IRENÆUS, Lib. V. cap. xxx. p. 448. edit. Grabe.

SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX,' &c., to be deemed *ignorant of the true Number 666*. And yet Professor Lee has ventured (upon his own *ipse dixit*, and that of *Archbishop Laud*, and the *Codex of Petavius*, the French *Jesuit*.) to set aside such *ancient authority*, by bringing forward the *spurious Number* χις', or 616, and thereby has left the learned world in *complete ambiguity concerning the Number* χξς', or 666. We have already shewn that *Dr. Adam Clarke*, the *Rev. George Stanley Faber*, *Cardinal Bellarmine*, *Grotius*, and others, affirm that the *orthography* of *Irenæus* is *incorrect*, and thus the NAME *Λατῆivos*, as well as the NUMBER *χξς'*, 666, of *St. John* have BOTH been seemingly invalidated. Who then will venture to become *Umpire* among such discordant Theologians? Who will play the man, in raising *Irenæus* from the dust of such theological controversialists? Nay, *behold! Irenæus lives again!* for, ¹“ *he, being dead, yet speaketh*” to us in *his writings!* Yes, he shall come forth from his shrouded mantle of obscurity to *confront* these learned men, and as their *senior*, in point of time, in accuracy of investigation, in fidelity of orthography, and in soundness of argument, shall settle the point at issue; that is to say, without a figure, succeeding *events* have become the *literal Interpreters* of the NAME of the MAN, which has been so long veiled under an *enigma*; hence we KNOW that what *IRENÆUS* only *CONJECTURED* in the *SECOND CENTURY* of the Christian *Æra*, is *most manifestly fulfilled* in the *NINETEENTH*, and that no

¹ Heb. xi. 4.

further doubt can remain on the subject in the minds of those who will undertake the easy task of comparing *his conjectures* with *matters of Fact*.

Let us therefore *take good heed to the words of Father IRENÆUS*, whose *ancient, learned, and pious testimony* is *invaluable*; for he has given to *Protestants* the *Master Key to Popery*, and has thereby constructed for the Christian world, a *Bulwark of Defence* against the *innovations and usurpations* of the LATIN PAPAL MAN, whose *Latin* titles are—‘*Pontifex Maximus*,’ ‘*Sanctissimus Pater*,’ &c. and especially to the following FIVE POINTS the moral certainty of which *Irenæus* has established *beyond refutation*.

CHAPTER XIV.

FIVE REASONS DRAWN FROM IRENÆUS ESTABLISHING THE MORAL CERTAINTY OF HIS ORTHOGRAPHY IN THE NAME *Λατῆινος*, WITH FURTHER REMARKS ON THE OPINIONS OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD AND PROFESSOR LEE.

IRENÆUS.

I. THAT the “*wisdom*” and “*understanding*” of which *St. John* spake concerning the solution of the enigmatical Number $\chi\xi\zeta'$, 666, was, that “The NUMBER of a MAN,” must necessarily imply the NAME of a MAN; i. e., “*Numerus Hominis*,” being put for “*Numerus Nominis Hominis*,” and therefore *Irenæus*, in explaining the words of *St. John*, has, without hesitation, supplied the manifest *Ellipsis*, and given us THREE several examples of proper Names written in Greek Letters, viz. *Ευανθας*, *Λατῆινος*, and *Τῆταν*.

II. *Irenæus* has established the correctness of the

Number χξς' by his own use of it in Greek Numerals,¹ καταλλήλως οὖν καὶ τὸ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ ἔξει τὸν ἀριθμὸν χξς'; and each of those *Three proper Names* which he has given, exhibits the *exact Number* 666. Thus he says,² 'Εν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ αρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ΑΡΙΘΜΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ, &c. "IN OMNIBUS ANTIQUIS et PROBATISSIMIS et VETERIBUS SCRIPTURIS NUMERÔ HÔC POSITÔ, et TESTIMONIUM *perhibentibus his*, QUI FACIE AD FACIEM JOANNEM VIDERUNT," (*in all the Ancient and most approved and old Scriptures THIS NUMBER is placed, and the Testimony attributed to them who had SEEN John face to face,*) "et ratione docente nos, quoniam NUMERUS NOMINIS *bestiæ* (κατὰ τὴν τῶν ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ψῆφον,) *secundum GRÆCORUM computationem per LITERAS quæ in eo sunt, SEXCENTOS habebit, et SEXAGINTA, et SEX,*" &c. And further on in the *same chapter* he says respecting the Number 666,³ "Oportet itaque tales discere, et ad VERUM recurrere NOMINIS NUMERUM: ut non in PSEUDO-PROPHETARUM loco deputentur. Sed SCIENTES FIRMUM NUMERUM qui à SCRIPTURA (from SCRIPTURE) *annunciatus est*, id est, SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX," &c.; and in page 449 of the same Chapter, he sets forth the Name Λατῆινος as containing the Number 666,⁴ "Sed et LATEINOS *nomen habet SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX numerum: et valde verisimile est, quoniam NOVISSIMUM REGNUM HOC habet VOCABULUM. LATINI*

¹ IRENÆ. lib. V. cap. xxix. p. 446.² Ibid. cap. xxx. p. 447.³ Ibid. cap. xxx. p. 448.⁴ Ibid. p. 449.

enim sunt qui nunc Regnant," &c. And having summed up, in Chapter XXIX., the Iniquity and Apostacy of the Numbered Beast, (deduced from the *opinions of the Ancients* concerning the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666,) in whom would *concentre ALL unrighteousness*, Irenæus exclaims—

¹ " Et propter hoc in BESTIA veniente *Recapitulatio sit universæ Iniquitatis et omnis doli*, ut in EA (scil. BESTIA) confluens et conclusa omnis virtus Apostatica, in caminum mittatur ignis. Congruenter autem et NOMEN EJUS habebit NUMERUM, SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX, recapitulans in semetipso *omnem quæ fuit antediluvium*, malitiæ commixtionem, quæ facta est ex Angelica Apostasia." And *such Testimony may suffice as PROOF* in favour of the TRUE NUMBER $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, set against the *spurious Number* $\chi\iota\varsigma'$, 616, brought forward by *Professor Lee*; inasmuch as the *latter number* would be classed by *Irenæus* with the *ipse dixit*, " PSEUDOPROPHETARUM," i. e. of *False Prophets*.

III. *Irenæus* has established to a moral certainty the *ancient* and legitimate *uses of the Diphthong, Broad, or Circumflexed iota* as \digamma , $\epsilon\iota$ or $\hat{\iota}$, by his own use of it in *Two several Names* pertaining to the self-same subject, viz. $\Lambda\text{ATEINO}\varsigma$ and TEITAN , and as he wrote "*Contra omnes Hæreses*," it is most *unreasonable to suppose him ignorant of the orthography of such Names*, and as to his *Grammatical correctness* see Chapter XV. of this work; besides which a *circumflexed iota* $\hat{\iota}$ is generally, if not

¹ IRENÆ. cap. xxix. p. 446.

always equivalent to the diphthong $\epsilon\iota$, or $\epsilon\iota$, and therefore the Rev. Geo. S. Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, and others, are convicted of ignorance touching the ancient orthography of the Diphthong or Circumflexed Iota in the Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and Irenæus is thus proved to be the best Grammarian.

IV. *Irenæus* has moreover established to a moral certainty that the *Proper* and *Appellative Name* of “The *Man of Sin*,” “The *Son of Perdition*,” the “MAN” whose Number is $\chi\xi\zeta'$, 666, is $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, for what *he* wrote *conjecturally* in the second *Century* (*ante Eventum*) may, with the strictest propriety, be spoken in the nineteenth *Century*, (*post Eventum*,) that, “*LATINI sunt qui nunc Regnant.*” ‘THEY are LATINS who NOW Reign.’ See Chapters XVI. XVII. XVIII. XIX. and XX. of this work.

V. *Irenæus* has yet further established that it is with the *individual Greek Letters*, which compose the *Name of the MAN* (according to *Greek Computation*) that *his Number* $\chi\xi\zeta'$ must be found to agree, as he says, “*Quoniam NUMERUS NOMINIS Bestiæ secundum GRÆCORUM COMPUTATIONEM per LITTERAS quæ in EO sunt, SEXCENTOS habebit, et SEXAGINTA, et SEX,*” &c. and therefore, we conclude that the calculation is effected *neither* by the means of the *Three $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$* , nor any of the numerous *Greek Contractions* or *Ligatures of Letters*, but by *LETTERS ONLY*, separately and individually taken, which was the *only established METHOD* of calculating the *Names of Men*, &c. among all *Greek writers*,

and to depart from this Alphabetical Rule is altogether contrary to sound Orthography. We may here also remind our readers, that as *St. John* wrote his Gospel, Epistles, and the Book of the Revelation in the Greek Language, as the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, 666, is written in Greek Characters, it may most plainly be inferred that the NAME of the "MAN," which is answerable to the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, must likewise be written in GREEK LETTERS.

We may conclude from the foregoing observations why the universal Opinion concerning the integrity of the mystical Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ did not please Archbishop Laud, (*Numeralis illa Theologia non MIHI placet,*) which is no great marvel when we consider that many earlier, more learned, sound, and pious polemical writers than his Lordship (both at home and abroad,) had found as great perplexities as he did, in attempting to solve to their entire satisfaction this mystical numerical Enigma of "666," and hence his Lordship's assertion concerning the Number, '*non sapit spiritum apostolicum,*' indicates his vexation at not being able to comprehend the Name of the Man, or "the Number of his Name," according to his own limited views, and he therefore cuts the matter short by a most startling and dogmatical assertion, "*non sapit spiritum Apostolicum:*" putting his Archiepiscopal veto upon the Number 666 as unsound or doubtful: however, as the said Archbishop was more than half a Papist, there need be no wonder at his Lordship's brevity and manner of Decision; but, be it remembered,

that *Irenæus* was one of the *earliest* and *most authentic* of the *Christian Fathers*, and has handed down to us the *most probable Appellative Name* of the “MAN,” (Lateinos,) for the reasons which he there assigns, and his *Number* by (“Sexcentorum Sexaginta Sex,”) and has *denounced* all *Pseudo-Prophetic Numbers*, (“ut non in *Pseudo-prophetarum loco deputentur*, sed scientes *firmum Numerum qui à SCRIPTURA annuntiatus est, id est, SEXCENTORUM SEXAGINTA SEX:*”) and there can be no Reason for the establishment of the *Pseudo-prophetic Number* χις' or 616, until the APOSTOLIC NUMBER χξς', 666, be FIRST *disproved*, which I firmly believe can never be effected by honest means; nor can the *MODE of eliciting the Number* from the individual Letters of the *Man's Name* ever be *doubted*, so long as the *writings of Irenæus* are *extant*. Besides all this, the *best* and *earliest Greek Testament*, M. SS. CODICES, LECTIONES; VERSIONES, (except the single Codex of Petavius the Jesuit, which is lodged in the Vatican Library,) have written the Number in the TEXT by the *Three Characters* χξς' according to *Irenæus*; but *more modern writers* have sometimes written this Number at full length by the three words expressive of the said Number, viz. ἑξακοσιοι ἑξηκοντα ἕξ, and our *English Version* has rendered the said Number by the words “SIX HUNDRED THREESCORE AND SIX.” Moreover, *Cardinal Bellarmine*, although at the very time a *thorough Papist*, disputing against the *orthography of Irenæus*, in his use of the *Diphthong*, or broad ϕ or $\epsilon\iota$ in the name *Λατῆνος*, has nevertheless

allowed the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, to be the true Reading, according to the opinion of Irenæus: thus (after the multiplicity of examples quoted in the VIth Chapter of this work) there will be infinite difficulty in admitting the solitary and pseudo-apostolic citation of the Number $\chi\upsilon\varsigma'$ 616, brought forward by Professor Lee, backed by the demi-papistical opinion of Archbishop Laud. It is evident that the Hebrew Professor felt some difficulty in producing one learned sanction for the use of the Number $\chi\upsilon\varsigma'$ 616, and that which he has produced must be rejected, if the Opinion of Irenæus be true, for that Christian Father has appealed to the HOLY SCRIPTURES in the most unequivocal manner for confirmation of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, in the following words,— ‘ Oportet, itaque tales dicere, et ad VERUM recurrere NOMINIS NUMERUM: ut non in Pseudo-prophetarum loco deputentur. Sed scientes FIRMUM NUMERUM qui à SCRIPTURA annunciatus est, id est, Sexcentorum Sexaginta Sex:’ as well as to “ those who had seen the Apostle John face to face.” Qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt.’

It will be evident upon a little consideration, that by the discovery of the true NAME of the MAN, whose NUMBER is declared to be $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, we shall find the DESTINIES of the Babylonish Church of Rome, or in other words, the LATIN Church, inasmuch ¹ as the “ 1260 DAYS ” of Years, have already expired, and, consequently, She ² is “ OLD ” and “ ready to vanish away.”

¹ Rev. xii. 6, 14.

² Heb. viii. 13.

St. Paul has given us a *criterion* whereby to judge righteous judgment, when he says, that ¹ “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him;” (*non sibi placet*) “neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Now, though Archbishop Laud asserts, concerning the prophetic Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, “*non sapit spiritum Apostolicum* :” it is evident from the *general style of Irenæus*, as well as from what he has *particularly written on the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$* , that *his writings savour much more of the Apostolic Spirit and wisdom*, than those of Archbishop Laud, (witness the *Christian age* in which Irenæus lived, and that he was the *Disciple of Polycarp*, the latter of whom was the *Disciple of St. John*,) and therefore a *comparison* between the *Spiritual or Theological wisdom* of the two *Bishops (Irenæus and Laud)* would afford a mighty contrast, for example, Irenæus was *confessedly One of the earliest and most authentic of the Christian Fathers*; but *can the same thing be predicated of Archbishop Laud?* we know that *it cannot*, but the *very contrary!* and, therefore, I think we are bound by *Christian obligation* to prefer the *pious and learned Testimony of father Irenæus*, with regard to the *fidelity of the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$* , or 666, which he has so clearly given us, rather than the *Pseudo-prophetic or Pseudo-apostolic Number $\chi\iota\varsigma'$* , or 616. Besides, if we believe that his Lordship had ever read Irenæus “*Contra omnes Hæreses*,” Chapters 29 and 30 of

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

the Vth Book, yet his egotism, in expressing his opinion, is so palpable, that it scarcely needs a remark; for his words are evidently meant to *imply* as much as, that because a Theological Numeral did not please him, therefore it did not emanate from the *wisdom* of the *Apostolic Spirit*, (an Inference which, if admitted, would be fraught with *most dangerous consequences*, both to the *Word of God*, and the *Christian Church*.) “*Numeralis illa theologia, non MIHI placet . . . NON SAPIT SPIRITUM APOSTOLICUM.*” But who will venture to affirm, that because this Theological Numeral did not please the *then* Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, therefore, the *words of St. John* and of *Irenæus* respecting this Number $\chi\xi\zeta'$, were not true? or that they did not savour of the *Apostolic Spirit*? Yet such is the necessary inference we must draw from the *assertion* of the Archbishop, if we are to consider his *Lordship's Opinion* on this Number of *paramount authority*. But that it is *not worthy of credence* has been *proved* in a variety of particulars, wherefore, until *Professor Lee* can furnish us with *more substantial marks of orthodoxy*, than those exhibited in his “*Dissertations on Prophecy*,” respecting the bare assertion of Archbishop Laud, “*non sapit spiritum Apostolicum,*” we are bound to *reject them* as *Pseudo-prophetic*, and *Pseudo-Apostolic* and *Pseudo-Archiepiscopal*, according to the *veritable Opinion of Irenæus*. Consequently the learned Professor of Hebrew must seek a little further for a better authority with which to invalidate the integrity of the Number $\chi\xi\zeta'$ as written

by St. John, and confirmed by Irenæus. In truth he must retrace his steps to seek for a better Champion of Truth than a *Demi-Papist*; for however Archbishop Laud may be admired as a learned polemical writer, the *unsoundness* of his opinion concerning the number 666, is at variance with the *acknowledged Canon of Scripture*, as well as the *Testimony of Papists*. See “η Καινη Διαθηκη. *Novum Jesu Christi Domini nostri Testamentum*. TEXTUI GRÆCO conjuncta est versio Latina Vulgata, *Summorum Pontificum*, SIXTI V. et CLEMENTIS VIII. *autoritate edita et recognita*. Tomus III. *Lutetiæ Parisiorum*, Apud Nicholaum Buon. &c. 1628,” wherein the Number 666 is written in Greek numerals by “χξς’,” and the Latin Vulgate by “*Sexcenti Sexaginta Sex*.”

We may partly judge of the *meek* and *Christian Spirit* in which *Irenæus* sought to find the *Name of the Man*, according to his given arithmetical Number χξς’, from the following words, “Quoniam autem non propter inopiam nominum habentium numerum ejus dicimus hæc, sed propter TIMOREM ERGA DEUM, et ZELUM VERITATIS: ETΑΝΘΑΣ enim NOMEN habet NUMERUM de quo quæritur: sed nihil de eo affirmamus. Sed et LATEINOS NOMEN habet Sexcentorum Sexaginta Sex numerum: et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum Regnum hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant: sed non in hoc nos gloriabimur.” It is presumed, therefore, that *Irenæus* was perfectly correct with regard to the Number χξς’, 666, and in the idea that

the *proper* and *Appellative Name of the Beast* must be the *Name of some particular MAN*, and also in his most wonderful *conjecture*, (which was conceived *centuries* before the *EVENT came to pass*) concerning the Proper or Appellative Name *Λατῆνος*, which is the Name of a Man ; the *orthography* of which, in reference to the *Diphthong* *δ* or *ει*, is *INDISPUTABLE*, it being of too classical a nature to present a doubt to the mind of any Greek scholar. [See Chapter XV. of this work.] It is equally presumed, therefore, that as Irenæus was *right* in his *conjectures*, so Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, Archbishop Laud, Dr. Adam Clarke, Rev. George S. Faber, and Professor Lee, are *palpably wrong* in their *several hypotheses* ; and this is little enough to say of their versatility, for it is extremely wonderful to observe Men eminent for very high literary acquirement, and for Talents far surpassing my own, not only differing from each other in the widest degree when writing on the same given subject, but also palpably erroneous with regard to the plainest points of orthography ; and this wonder is heightened in the case of Dr. Adam Clarke, who, (as all England attests, was most highly gifted in the knowledge of ancient manuscripts; and the manner of deciphering them,) having written so much in favour of Irenæus, has nevertheless sought the Name of the Beast in the *Sentence*, *ἡ Λατινὴ βασιλεία*, (*the Latin Kingdom*) instead of, in the Name *Λατῆνος*, which latter is the well known historical *Name of the MAN*, who was the *founder of LATIUM*, (from

whence sprang the LATIN RACE,) and which is so generally approved by Commentators, that I shall give the Doctor's own opinion concerning it. "Many *Names*," says the Doctor, "have been proposed, from time to time, as applicable to the Beast, and at the same time containing 666. We will only notice ONE Example, that *famous one of Irenæus*, which has been *approved of by almost all Commentators, who have given any sort of tolerable exposition of the Revelation*. The word alluded to is *Λατῆινος*." &c.

Surely it may in truth be affirmed, that all Commentators and writers on this Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, who have preferred their own Chimeras to the irrefutable *Opinion of IRENÆUS*, have most miserably mistaken their subject; for it is by the *individual LETTERS* which compose the Name of the Man, that his Number 666 must be found to harmonize, and thus alone can an end be put to all strife. At length, however, the Triumph of "*well done good and faithful*" IRENÆUS shall be re-echoed through the Christian world, to the *confusion of the POPE* and his *spurious LATIN Church*.

There can be little doubt entertained that Professor Lee, noticing the vast variety of speculations which had been ventured on, relative to the Number $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666, and knowing that they were utterly irreconcilable with the words of ¹ St. John, has chosen the *shortest method* of settling the business, namely, by *discarding the Number altogether*, even as Archbishop Laud

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

had done before him. However, it is most easy to place the whole matter beyond the *possibility of future doubt or disputation*, as will be seen by attending to the following *Ancient and Classical Authorities* in favour of the *Diphthong*, or *Broad*, or *circumflexed iota*, as $\epsilon\hat{\iota}$, or $\epsilon\grave{\iota}$, or $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ in $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and by showing why the Name *LATEINOS* (which is the point in question) has been so often rejected, and that is, because the *Orthography of the Diphthong* was not generally acknowledged or understood, although *IRENÆUS*, *Dr. Henry More*, *Bishop Newton*, and *many others*, had led the way for its establishment.

CHAPTER XV.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE DIPHTHONG, OR THE BROAD,
OR CIRCUMFLEXED IOTA IN THE NAME *Λατῆινος*,
Λατφνος, *Λατῖνος*, THAT IS,

ει, or *ϝ*, or *ι̇*.

It has been already proved that the following *Epithets*, *Names*, and *Sentences*, are wholly insufficient for establishing the NAME *of a MAN*, namely *Αποσταης*, *Μαομετις*, *η Λατινη βασιλεια*, *Εκκλησια Ιταλικά*, &c. and that neither Professor Lee, nor Archbishop Laud are justified in their rejection of the Number *χξς'*. We now proceed (in maintaining the Name *Λατῆινος*,) to the production of those authorities (hitherto too much wanting) for the *genuine use of the Diphthong*, or *Broad*, or *circumflexed iota*, *ει*, *ϝ*, or *ι̇*, which will *lay a foundation* for the full establishment of the *Orthography of IRENÆUS*, which has been so unceremoniously and unjustifiably assailed by the *ipse dixit* of Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, The Rev. George Stanley Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, and

others, the former of whom has displayed his Jesuitical cunning for the preservation of his despotic LATIN or *Papal Church*, as the three latter have evinced their *Ignorance of Antiquity*, both with respect to the prevalence of the Diphthong $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\iota$, and to the circumstance of the *circumflexed iota*, $\hat{\iota}$, being *generally, if not always equivalent to a Diphthong*. It will only be necessary, therefore, to produce a sufficient number of Classical and ancient examples for the frequent use of the Diphthong, Broad, Long, or Circumflexed Iota, and thus silence all further *doubts or disputes* respecting the Name $\Lambda\alpha\tau\hat{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, in *this point of view*. The simple fact that *Irenæus* has used *two Names*, pertaining to the elucidation of the *numbered Man*, viz. $\Lambda\alpha\tau\hat{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha\nu$, in each of which the ϵ is expressed, (and not $\Lambda\alpha\tau\hat{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha\nu$ without the ϵ as written in modern times) might be considered a *sufficiently ancient authority* for the *use of the Diphthong or Long $\epsilon\iota$* , in the Name in question, as he lived in times when the said *Diphthong* was in *common use*, both among the *Greeks*, and *Romans*, or *Latins*. But as this matter has been heedlessly questioned by Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, Rev. G. S. Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, and others, I would beg to call the attention of my Readers to the following notable authorities, and *if they can be overthrown, I will then give up the point, but not till then*.

¹ ENNIUS is, perhaps, one of the most ancient

¹ *Ennius*, Lib. vi. 26. See Dr. Henry More's Works, p. 595, and Bishop Newton's Dissert. II. p. 299.

LATIN authors who has given us the name LATEINOS with *two diphthongs* in it, and not only so, but he has set forth *five* examples of the broad EI, (as in common use among the Romans,) in one single line,

‘ Quam preimum cascei Popolei tenuere Lateinei.’

Also in the *seventh Book of his Annals*, as quoted by *Dr. Henry More*, we have the two following examples; the same Author assuring us that in ENNIUS there are *infinite examples* of a *similar use of the Diphthong*, and in this opinion *Dr. More* is followed by *Bishop Newton*,

‘ Quorum virtutei bellei fortuna pepercit,

‘ Horundem me leibertatei parcere certum est.’

also :

‘ Poinei sunt solitei sos sacrificare puellos

‘ Diveis:’

to which I shall add another,

‘ Civeis Romanei tunc factei sunt Campanei.

‘ Nos sumu’ Romanei, qui fuvimus ante Rudinei.

‘ Omneis mortaleis sese laudari exoptant.

‘ Forteis Romanei, quanquam Cœlus profundus.’

¹ M. TERENTIUS VARRO is another very ancient writer, who has given us so many examples of the broad EI, that from the ivth to the ixth Book inclusive, concerning the *Latin Tongue*, “ *De Lingua Latinâ*,” I have counted 1060 at least, a few of which I shall here produce :—

‘ Quæ ideo videtur à Latineis, Juno Lucina dicta,’

¹ *M. Terentii Varronis Opera in Lib. de Ling. Lat. edit. Parisiis, 1585.*

&c. p. 19. ‘Castoris nomen Græcum et Pollucis à *Græceis* in *Latineis littereis* veteribus nomen,’ &c. p. 20. ‘Sunt etiam animalia in aqua, quæ in terdum in terram exeunt alia *Græceis vocabuleis*, ut Polypus, &c. alia *Latineis*, ut Rana,’ &c. p. 21. ‘Nisi à *Græceis*, quòd *Atheneis* in *libreis* sacrorum scriptum est,’ p. 25. Lepus, quòd è *Siculeis* quidam Græcei dicunt,’ p. 26. ‘Sic hic quòd erat post diem quintum *eidus*, Quinquartus.’ ‘Megalesia dicta à *Græceis*, quòd ex libris *Sybillineis*,’ &c. ‘In *Tusculaneis sacreis* est,’ p. 47. ‘Similiter, Latinæ feriæ dies conceptivus dictus à *Latineis populeis*, quibus ex Albano monte ex *sacreis* carnem petere fuit jus cum *Romaneis*: à quibus *Latineis* Latinæ dictæ,’ p. 49, also *Atellaneis*, *Argiveis*, *Lybyceis*, *Lucaneis*, *Puteoleis*, *Tusceis*, *Sabineis*, *Atheneis*, *Syracuseis*, *Quiriteis*: also *Palentei*, *Græcei*, *Argei*, *Aristarchei*, *dandei*, *vocandei*, *appellandei*, *dicandei*, *jungendei*, *adminiculandei*, *nominandei*, *augendei*, *lavandei*, *nummei*; also *heis*, *queis*, *noneis*, *illeis*, *sueis*, *treis*, *ieis*, *eeis ipseis*, *heic*, *illeic*, *heisce*, *hei*, &c. I shall conclude these examples of the Diphthong out of VARRO, with one from ¹ SCALIGER.

‘Jovis Pater, si mihei es autor, urbi popo’loque Rom. Quiritium, hæc sane sartéque esse, uti tu nunc mihei bene sponis, beneque volueris.’

² PLAUTUS in his Comedies makes frequent use of the broad EI.

¹ *Josephi Scaligeri conjectanea* in Lib. quint. *M. Terentii Varronis*, de Lingua Latinâ, p. 85, 86. 1

² *Plauti Comædiæ*. Edit. Aldus, 1522.

‘ Is advenienteis servom, et dominum frustra habet,’ p. 1.

‘ Vox mihi ad aureis advolavit,’ p. 6.

‘ Illiscæ præfeci Cephalum magni DEIONEI filium.’ p. 17.

‘ Suspiciabar, atq ; insonteis miseris cruciabar.’ p. 31.

Sese alternas cum illo nocteis hanc frui, nam in impetro,’ p. 32.

‘ Æquas habemus parteis.’ p. 236.

‘ Ne dormienteis quidem sinunt quiescere,’ p. 237.

Volgo adse omneis,’ p. 284.

¹ QUINTILIAN, testifies that Lucilius would have us to write *puerei*, *mendacei*, *furei*, although now accustomed to write it *pueri*, *mendaci*, *furi*.

² SCAPULA, who was a good Greek Grammarian and Lexicographer, and whose authority is received by the Learned, has remarked that the Letter I long was written and pronounced among the ancient Romans, as the diphthong *ɔ*, that is to say *ε* ; and had an *ε* enclosed, as was constantly the case in the time of CICERO.

‘ I, *ε*, i.

‘ ΙΩΤΑ, Iota trissyllabam ab Hebræo Iod, t pro d usurpato, respondet i Latino.

‘ *Cæcilius* hanc literam vocat pumilionem, quòd

¹ QUINTIL. Institut. Orator. De Orthographia. Lib. i. cap. 7. Edit. Parisiis, 1543.

² SCAPULA in Append. ad Lexicon : de Veteri et Recta Græcæ Linguae pronuntiatione.

omnium et figura et sono tenuissima sit et minima: et si quidem *μονόγραμμα*. PLATO indicat accommodam esse ad exprimendas res subtiles et penetrabiles, quod declarant, ut ait, *ἰέναι, ἰέσθαι*, ac similia. Itaque planè aliter sunt proferenda *η υ ει οι υ*, *quàm ι*: ne inter legendum incidamus in *ῥωτακισμὸν* et *πολύϊατα*, quæ orationem faciunt exilem, enervem, pipientem et confusam. Neque enim *χριστός* sonandum ut *χρησός*: neque *κίων* ut *κύν*, *μηκρὸν* longum, ut *μικρὸν* parvum.’

¹ HUBERT GOLTZIUS in his ‘*Thesaurus rei Antiquariæ*’ has given us 227 instances of Greek inscriptions of the Medals of Roman Emperors and Empresses, most of which are written with the diphthong *ει* or *ει*, and with the ancient sigma *C* instead of *Σ*, as Agrippina, *ΑΓΡΙΠΠΕΙΝΑ* ... Sabina, *ΚΑΒΕΙΝΑ* Plotina, *ΠΛΩΤΙΕΙΝΑ* Antoninus, *ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΣ* Faustina, *ΦΑΥΣΤΕΙΝΑ* Crispina, *ΚΡΙΣΠΕΙΝΑ* .. Niger, *ΝΕΙΓΡΟΣ* .. Septimus, *ΣΕΠΤΕΙΜΙΟΣ* ... Albinus, *ΑΛΒΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Macrinus, *ΜΑΚΡΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Maximinus, *ΜΑΞΙΜΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Balbinus, *ΒΑΛΒΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Sabina Tranquillina, *ΚΑΒΕΙΝΑ ΤΡΑΝΚΥΛΛΕΙΝΑ* Marinus, *ΜΑΡΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Salonina, *ΣΑΛΩΝΕΙΝΑ* ... Saturninus, *ΣΑΤΤΥΡΝΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Carinus, *ΚΑΡΕΙΝΟΣ* ... Constantinus, *ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΕΙΝΟΣ* *ΑΔΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΝ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ* ... *ΑΜΦΙΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ* ... Ariminum, *ΑΡΙΜΕΙΝΕΩΝ*. And at page 284, he remarks that *ει* is put for *ι*, as ‘*ΕΙ* pro *Ι*, ut *ΕΙδus* pro *Ιδus* ... ‘*ΛΕΙ*-bertas pro *Libertas* ... *ΣΕΡΥΕΙΛΙΟΣ* pro *Seruilius*, et in multis aliis.’

¹ Huberti Goltzii *Thesaurus rei Antiquariæ*, edit. Antverpiæ, 1644.

The ¹ SIEUR A. DE LA MOTRAYE, in his *Voyages* to the *Chersonesus* and *Adrianople*, has exhibited several examples of the ancient use of the broad *ei*, in the MEDALS of the *Emperor* ANTONINUS and of his wife FAUSTINA, which are thus written, ANTONEINOC and ΘΕΙΑ ΦΑΥCΤΕΙΝΑ. See *Voyages* D. à D. L. *Motraye—Chersonese*, Tome I. Chapitre XX. pag. 425. Figure No. xxviii. *Médailles* 19 et 26.—Idem, Tome II. Chapitre V. pag. 157, Figure No. VII. *Médailles* 2, 3, 18, et 19.

² JOSEPH DE L'ESCALE, or SCALIGER, whom RAYMOND calls (not without cause) the worthy Son of the great Julius, the Eye of Europe, and the marvel of LETTERS, tells us that the Greeks write their Letter *iota* in the diphthong *ei*, when they produce it before an N, as *Αντωνεῖνος*, *Σαβεῖνος*, *Λατεῖνος*, in *Irenæus*. That which custom therefore has established, not only is it no fault (says he) to write it so ; but it would appear necessary to make it so.

ST. JEROME. It is obvious from this Christian Father that the custom of writing the diphthong or broad *ei* for *i*, was not only adopted before the N, but also before *other* Letters, as when Irenæus wrote Τεῖταν for Τιταν, when the ancients wrote Μειθρας *Meithras* for Μιθρας *Mithras*, which is the *Name of the SUN* among the PERSIANS: upon which also

¹ Voyage D'a. D. L. MOTRAYE: Chersonese et Adrianople.

² REMOND. Chap. 39. de l'Antichrist. SCALIGER. animad. ad Chron. EUSEB. p. 106.

depends the understanding of that passage of St. JEROME, which mentions that *Basilidès* calls ¹ God by this prodigious Name $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\xi\alpha\varsigma$, and he says, that, according to the GREEK LETTERS, and the number of courses of the year which were contained in the *Cycle of the Sun*, and which the *Pagans* under the same number of other Letters, call $\mu\epsilon\iota\theta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ and not $\mu\upsilon\theta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ as we read in the common examples. For $\mu\epsilon\iota\theta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ and $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\xi\alpha\varsigma$ render the one and the other by their *individual Letters* 365, which is the Number of Days in the Year, as will be seen below: whereas $\mu\upsilon\theta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ will produce by its individual Letters the much greater Number 750.

α' = ..1	μ' = .40
β' = ..2	ϵ' = ..5
ρ' = 100	ι' = .10
α' = ..1	θ' = ..9
ξ' = .60	ρ' = 100
α' = ..1	α' = ..1
ς' = 200	ς' = 200
<hr/>	<hr/>
365	365
<hr/>	<hr/>

² EDWARD WRIGHT, Esq. in his '*Travels through France, Italy, and Florence, &c.* in the years 1720, 1721, and 1722, has made the following '*observations*,' which may throw some light on the foregoing words of *St. Jerome*, in reference to $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\xi\alpha\varsigma$ and $\mu\epsilon\iota\theta\rho\alpha\varsigma$.

¹ HIERONY. Cap. 3. Comment in AMOS, c. 3.

² WRIGHT'S Hist. of Florence, &c. Vol. ii. p. 415. London, 1730.

‘ I saw several *Talismans*,’ (says Mr. Wright) ‘ and the other magical Stones called *Abraxas*, with various Inscriptions, some in GREEK *Letters*, but the words CHALDEE; at least so Signor *Bianchi* told us: I pretend not to understand that Language; but of *Greek* signification I am sure they were not.’

‘ The Magical Stones called *Abraxas* are engraved Stones, used by the ÆGYPTIANS and PERSIANS to represent the *Chief Deity* who made the Heavens, which they reckon *three hundred and sixty-five in number*, answerable to the *Days in the Year*; and in the several *Greek* numeral Letters of that Name added together, that Number is found, as will be seen by what immediately follows.’

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 A & = & \dots 1 \\
 B & = & \dots 2 \\
 P & = & 100 \\
 A & = & \dots 1 \\
 X & = & \dots 60 \\
 A & = & \dots 1 \\
 \Sigma & = & 200 \\
 & & \hline
 & & 365 \\
 & & \hline
 \end{array}$$

‘ The same was also signified by *Mithras*, writing it with an [E] before the [I], ΜΕΙΘΡΑΣ, as here under :—

$$M = . 4 0$$

$$E = . . 5$$

$$I = . 1 0$$

$$\Theta = . . 9$$

$$P = 1 0 0$$

$$A = . . 1$$

$$\Sigma = 2 0 0$$

$$3 6 5$$

‘*Talismans* are often, if not for the most part, in *metal*: both these were supposed to have great efficacy in charming away Diseases, putting to flight evil Spirits, prolonging Life, and doing abundance of other Feats. The *Gnostics*, particularly those of the school of *Basilidès*, being much addicted to Magick, did believe there was a great Virtue in this sort of thing.’

SCALIGER says that the Ancients ordinarily write $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\alpha$ by $\chi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$, (which signifies a thousand,) in his remarks on a passage of¹ *St. Jerome*, who, allegorizing on the *seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee before Baal*, by which, says he, is to be understood the Christians, adds moreover, that because we have said that the *number of seven thousand* relates to the name of Christians we compute in *Greek words*, $\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (not by $\chi\iota\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and you will find in the *two words* a *corresponding number and sum*, that is to say *one thousand nine*

¹ HIERONY. Comment in Zachariah, c. viii.

hundred and forty-one, (not *forty-six* as we commonly read it). For ἑπτακισχϵιλίους, which signifies seven thousand, and the word χριστιανους, render this number of 1941, even as we can see here, which reference though somewhat forced and out of the intention of the Text, nevertheless proves the legitimate use of the Diphthong ει, ei, instead of the I long.

Ε' =	..5		
π' =	.80		
τ' =	300		
α' =	..1		
κ' =	.20	χ' =	600
ι' =	.10	ρ' =	100
σ' =	200	ι' =	.10
κ' =	600	σ' =	200
ε' =	..5	τ' =	300
ι' =	.10	ι' =	.10
λ' =	.30	α' =	..1
ι' =	.10	ν' =	.50
ο' =	.70	ο' =	.70
υ' =	400	υ' =	400
ζ' =	200	ζ' =	200
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	1941		1941
	<hr/>		<hr/>

The SIBYLLINE ORACLES afford us an Example of the Name of CHRIST (χρῖστος) being written with the Diphthong EI, in the following manner,

ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΕΪΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ.

JESUS CHRIST OF GOD SAVIOUR CROSS

in an *Acrostic* which is among the *Oracles* attributed to the *Sibylls*.

² EUSEBIUS, a Christian and *Greek Father* of the *fourth Century* when writing the NAME of IRENÆUS in *Greek Letters*, begins it with the *Diphthong* *ει*, EI, as ΕΙρηναίος.

³ IRENÆUS. From the previously cited examples for the *ancient and general use of the Diphthong*, both among the *Greeks and Romans*, as well as from many other ancient authors whose names might easily be added to this catalogue, IRENÆUS is clearly acquitted of all grammatical incorrectness concerning the *orthography of the Names* Λατῆινος and Τῆϊταν, as he wrote them agreeably to the general *custom of the Age in which he lived*, and therefore ‘*Litera scripta manet.*’

Had the Rev. George Stanley Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, and others, only been content with the well-known classical *orthography of the Diphthong*, *Broad, Long, or Circumflexed*, *ει*, *ῑ* or *ῖ*, for the ancient use of which, both by the Greeks and Romans, there is such abundant evidence, as has been already adduced, *then* a different Result must have ensued, and I had

¹ SIBYLLINA ORACULA. Imprimez à Paris, l'An. 1599.

² EUSEB. Eccles. Hist. Lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 109. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

³ IRENÆ. Lib. V. cap. xxx. p. 449. Edit. Grabe. Oxoniæ. 1702.

been spared the pain and trouble of so much animadversion on their fruitless exertions. But when I beheld the *Truth of God's Word neutralized*, in reference to the *Number* χξς', or 666, by their production of *Words, Sentences, and Epithets, in lieu of the Name of a MAN*, and *falsified by the opinion of Professor Lee*, aided by a *Quotation from Archbishop Laud*, the *orthography and testimony of IRENÆUS impeached and rejected by the crafty-polemical discussions of Cardinal Bellarmine, Grotius, and Archbishop Laud*, I could no longer refrain from endeavouring to *exonerate both St. John and the Christian Father Irenæus from such Papistical indignity*; and in doing so, it appeared to me to be of the *greatest importance to RETAIN and ESTABLISH both the ORTHOGRAPHY and TESTIMONY of IRENÆUS* in reference to the *DIPHTHONG* d or ϵ , *as well as the Name* Λατῆνος, which is *in every respect appropriate*, inasmuch as it is the *NAME of a MAN*; contains the '*NUMBER of HIS NAME*' which is "666," and is in *every other point of view answerable to the LATIN Church of ROME*, and to *HER ONLY*; for *SHE ONLY* has *locked up the Word of God* for centuries past in the *LATIN LANGUAGE*, without any better *Sanction* than that of her *LATIN Papal MAN* (called the *POPE*), and his *Colleagues* (the *College of LATIN Cardinals*) in their *Inquisitorial Councils*.

From the *twofold* use of the *Diphthong* by *Irenæus* in the *Name* Λατῆνος and Τῆταν, and the *general use of the CIRCUMFLEX ACCENT* over the *iota*, as

[*î*] in the Name *Λατῖνος* which may be seen, not only in the *Greek Lexicons* and *Latin Dictionaries*, but likewise in *Greek Authors*, corroborated by the classical Authorities (both Greek and Latin), which have now been produced in favour of the *ancient use of the DIPHTHONG* *ει* or *ϝ*, for *î circumflexed*, it must be allowed (if *ANTIQUITY* be any *Sanction*) that there is a *DECIDED BALANCE* in favour of the *retention of the ancient Orthography* of *Irenæus*, notwithstanding the contrary *Opinions* of all his *Opponents*. And here I must repeat that a *CIRCUMFLEX ACCENT* is *generally, if not always, EQUIVALENT to a DIPHTHONG*, as *ι, ϝ, or î*, to wit *Λατῆινος, Λατϝος, Λατῖνος*. On these legitimate grounds, therefore, I have ventured to differ from *Mr. Faber, Dr. Clarke, Bellarmine, Grotius*, and others, on the subject of the Number *χξς'*, or 666; not indeed for the sake of singularity, or the vanity of Authorship, but because I wish to see a *better conclusion drawn from the genuine Premises laid down by St. John*; for to make an *assertion* is *one thing*, and to *prove a matter* is *another*. Having therefore shown that the *ANCIENT ORTHOGRAPHY* of *IRENÆUS* in his use of the *DIPHTHONG* was *perfectly legitimate* in both the Names *Τῆιταν* and *Λατῆινος*, I shall proceed by other arguments to prove that the *latter NAME* is the *ONLY appropriate solution* of the *Apostolical enigma*.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE AUTHENTICITY AND PROPRIETY OF THE
NAME *Λατῆινος*, AS APPLIED TO THE MAN, WHOSE
NUMBER IS *χξς'*, " 666."

ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ.

As the orthography of Irenæus, in his twofold use of the Diphthong *ει*, or *ει*, has been *proved* to be *Classically* and *Grammatically correct*, according to its ancient use, both among the Greeks and Romans, so likewise the Name *Λατῆινος*, though only CONJECTURED by him in the SECOND CENTURY, is, in the NINETEENTH, demonstrated by the concurrent Testimony of History's every page, to be the true *Appellative* of the *Numbered Beast*; for the Apostle *John* has not only furnished us with the *precise* NUMBER of the *Beast's* NAME, which is declared to be¹ "*Six Hundred Threescore and Six*:" but also with the NUMBER and LOCALITY of his KINGDOM in these

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

words :—¹ “ Here is the Mind which hath Wisdom. The *Seven Heads* are SEVEN MOUNTAINS, on which the *woman* SITTETH.” Now the *locality* of of the ‘ SEVEN MOUNTAINS ’ is *answerable to* ROME, because that renowned *City* was very anciently denominated in the page of History,² ‘ *The City of the Seven Hills,*’ or *Mountains, which environed it,* which description cannot be said to apply signally to the LOCALITY of ANY OTHER CITY of Renown in the World, and certainly *Papal Rome* is a most marvellous *Antitype* of *Ancient Babylon*, which is certainly referred to in this xviith Chapter of the Revelations, under the Title of “ MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT.” This we conclude from the description given of this meretricious Beast by St. John, and from the declaration of the Apostle in the same Chapter concerning that “ GREAT CITY,” which can be none other than *Rome, Mystical*, because the *literal* “ BABYLON THE GREAT ” was destroyed many Ages before St.

¹ Rev. xvii. 9.

² ‘ Hanc Remus et Frater ; sic fortis Etruria crevit ;
Scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma,
Septemq ; una sibi muro circumdedit Arces.’

Virgilii Georg. Lib. II. v. 6, 7, 8, à fine.

‘ Sed, quæ de *septem* totum circumspicit orbem
Montibus, Imperii Roma Dæum que locus.’

Ovid. Trist. Lib. I. El. V. v. 69, 70.
Argentoratium 1778.

‘ Dumque suis victrix *septem* de *Montibus* orbem
Prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.’

Ibid. Lib. III. El. VII. v. 51, 52.

‘ *Septem Urbs alta jugis*, toti quæ præsidet orbi,
Fæminias timuit territa Marte minas.’

Propertius, Lib. III. El. XI. v. 57, 58.
Lipsiæ. 1777.

John wrote his Revelation, and because *ancient Babylon* was neither seated on, nor surrounded by, nor celebrated for its 'SEVEN HILLS,' or *Mountains*, but on a plain. And as long as *Imperial Rome* continued to be the *Mistress of the world*, the *Papacy* could have no political nor spiritual Power to¹ "Come up out of the EARTH," that is, the ROMAN or LATIN EARTH, nor to establish a Temporal Kingdom there; but when the SEAT of the *Imperial Dignity* was removed from ROME to CONSTANTINOPLE, the *ancient Seat of the Empire* became Vacant. Thus with the *Change of Cities*, and subsequent overthrow of the Roman or Latin Kingdom by Barbarians, the² ἡ Αποστασία spoken of by St. Paul, took place soon after by the increasing secular Power of the *Bishop of Rome*; and then the *Second, or Ecclesiastical Roman Beast* (concerning whom it was predicted that he would³ ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ, "in his time," "exercise ALL the POWER of the FIRST BEAST,") began to "Rise up" from among the "SEVEN MOUNTAINS" or HILLS, in the vacant *Seat of old Rome*, in the reign of *Justinian*, A. D. 533. There has the Papal Ecclesiastical 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,' or *Latin Man*, "the Man of Sin," "the Son of Perdition," been SEATED ever since in the professed⁴ "Temple of God," dedicated to *St. Peter*, at *Rome*. Thus the remarkable Prophecies, both of St. Paul and St. John, have had their clearest and most literal fulfilment in those unexampled coin-

¹ Rev. xiii. 11.² 2 Thess. ii. 3.³ 2 Thess. ii. 6 compared with Rev. xiii. 12.⁴ 2 Thess. ii. 4.

cidences of successive EVENTS, which are the surest Interpreters of Prophecy, and comprise ALL that is requisite to demonstrate the Truth of that which was predicted concerning the *Numbered Beast*. Of this there can be no possible doubt existing in the *Present Age*, that is, with respect to his *Mark, Name, Number, Identity, Locality, Babylonish Attire*, with all other characteristics of his Mysterious Rise, Progress, Establishment, and final Destruction, as set forth by St. John and St. Paul; add to this, that St. John has given us the exact *period of the Reign* of the *Second Beast*, or Antichrist, viz. ¹ “*A Thousand and two hundred and Threescore Days*,” or “*A Time, and Times, and Half a Time*.” So that the NAME, SEAT of temporal and spiritual GOVERNMENT, and REIGN of the LATIN or ROMAN or ECCLESIASTICAL BEAST are ALL NUMBERED: that is to say, the NUMBER $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ or 666, for his *enigmatical, proper, and Appellative* NAME, which is LATEINOS. The “SEVEN MOUNTAINS,” for the SEAT of his KINGDOM, which is ROME, the *Antitype of Ancient Babylon*, that ² “*GREAT CITY* which (NOW) REIGNETH over the KINGS of the EARTH.” And the “1260 DAYS” of YEARS, for the allotted *Period of his* REIGN, which have been hitherto fulfilled by the long duration of the *Papal or Latin Hierarchy of Rome*, according to Prediction.

If LAMY the Papist, in his ‘*Apparatus Biblicus*,’ had cause to say in the *seventeenth Century*, “*In*

¹ Rev. xii. 6, 14.

² Rev. xvii. 18.

Italia ROMA condita, olim CAPUT totius MUNDI NUNC RELIGIONIS." ' *In Italy ROME is built, once the HEAD of the whole World, NOW of RELIGION :*' how much more may we bring down the conjectural words of IRENÆUS from the SECOND to the *Nineteenth Century*, and say with him, ' *LATEINOS NOMEN habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum ; et valde verisimile est, quoniam NOVISSIMUM REGNUM hoc habet vocabulum. LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC REGNANT.*' The Name LATEINOS has the Number 666 : and it is very much like, since ' *the LAST KINGDOM has this Number. For they are LATINS who NOW REIGN.*'

As the *old Roman or Latin Pagan Empire* has been succeeded by the *present Roman or LATIN Papal Hierarchy*, which latter has been acknowledged by *all the crowned Heads of Europe* for centuries past as the *Sovereign Pontifical Empire*, the HEAD of which has revived and adopted the *original Language of Old Rome*, viz. LATIN, and vaunteth himself to be (in the words of Lamy the Papist) the ' *HEAD of ALL Religion in the world ;* therefore, his *Papal Kingdom* may, in the words of Irenæus, be justly styled, " *Novissimum Regnum,*' the last Kingdom ; for the same Reason which Irenæus advanced in favour of the name *Λατῆνους* by applying it to *Pagan Rome*, in the 2nd Century, is most abundantly true at this moment, with reference to *Papal Rome*, viz. that ' *they are LATINS who NOW Reign.*'

' *All true Papists acknowledge the POWER of the Pope to be SUPREME, and the Result of his Councils*

(called *œcumenical*) to be *decisive* in all things, whether pertaining to the affairs of the *See of Rome* generally, or to the *deposition of Kings*; and that, the *LATIN* is the vernacular Language of the *Holy Roman Church* throughout the world, and those who will not acknowledge the *Pope's power*, are *anathema*.¹ “*The Holy Catholic and Apostolic ROMAN Church, Mother and Mistress of all other Churches without which there is no salvation :*” is ONE of the *ARTICLES* of the *ROMAN CREED*.

It is here well worthy of remark that the Apostle *Paul* in speaking of the “*Man of Sin*,” “*The Son of Perdition*,” says that HE ² “*SITTETH*” (καθίσαι) “*in the Temple of God ;*” a *Posture* by which the *Pope* is peculiarly known to the people of *ROME*, both in *St. PETER'S CHURCH*, and when he is *carried in State*. Also *St. John* in his *Interpretation* of the ‘*Seven Heads and Ten Horns*,’ uses the same expression as *St. Paul*, “*Here is the Mind which hath wisdom. The Seven Heads, are Seven Mountains* on which the *Woman*³ *SITTETH ;*” (κάθεται) and, therefore, *St. John* represents the *Beast* as saying,⁴ Κάθημαι βασίλισσα “*I SIT A QUEEN*.” And in common parlance the *people of Rome* are wont to say after the death of their *Pope*, and till the election of the new one; ‘*SEDE Vacante :*’ ‘*The vacant SEAT ;*’ that is, both of the *Spiritual* and *secular power*: and when the *Pope* is *carried in State* from the *Vatican Palace* to *St. Peter's Church*, and back again, the

¹ See ‘*Bishop Moreton's Church of Rome*,’ London 1628.

² 2 Thess. ii. 4.

³ Rev. xvii. 9.

⁴ Rev. xviii. 7.

vehicle on which HE SITS, and is borne on the shoulders of men, is called¹ ‘*SEDIA Gestatoria*,’ ‘*The Carried SEAT* :’ and this subject will receive further confirmation and illustration from the words of the *Sieur A. De La Motraye*, who says,

² “ La premiere fois que je vis le *Pape* en public, ce fut dans la *Grande et Magnifique Eglise* de *St. Pierre*, le 28 de Juin, veille de la *Fête de ce Saint*. Ce *Pontife* y étoit déjà quand j’y arrivai, et assis-toit aux premieres *Vêpres*, ASSIS sur un *TRÔNE*, avec une riche *MITRE* sur sa *Tête*, la *Falda*, (espece de jupe à longue queue, qui s’attache à la ceinture,) attachée à sa *Ceinture*, revêtu de la *Chappe Pontificale*, faite d’une *belle étoffe Rouge*, dont on use aux *Fêtes des Martirs*. Cette *chappe* étoit relevée d’une riche broderie, et attachée par une espece de crochet, ou de bouche d’or appelée *pectoral*, qui étoit enrichie de pierreries, *estimeés plus de 50 Mille écus*.’ ‘The first time I saw the POPE in public was in the GREAT and MAGNIFICENT CHURCH of *St. Peter* the 28th of June, the *Eve of the Fête of this Saint*. This *Pontiff* was already there when I arrived, and was SEATED on a *THRONE*, assisting at the first *Vespers*, with a *Rich Mitre on his Head*, and the *Falda* (a sort of Petticoat with a long train) attached to his Girdle. He wore the *Pontifical Cope* made of *fine Red stuff*, which is used at the *Fête of Martyrs*. This Garment was turned up with a rich embroidery, and fastened

¹ Edward Wright’s *Travels through Italy*, &c. Vol. i. p. 191. London 1730.

² *Sieur A. De La Motraye*, Tom. i. Chap. ii. page 21, 22. A La Haye 1696.

by a kind of hook or *buckle of Gold*, called *pectoral*, which was *enriched with precious stones*, *estimated at more than fifty thousand crowns.*'

The *Sieur A. De la Motraye*, in one of the *fourteen* particulars which he mentions relative to the *Pontifical Procession*, tells us in the *tenth*, of the *SEAT*, and manner of the *Pope* being *carried* on the *Day* of his *CORONATION*.

'X. LE SOUVERAIN PONTIFE, avec la même *Thiare*, et les mêmes habillemens qu'il avoit la veille. *Il etoit sur un Riche et Magnifique SIEGE, porté par huit hommes en longues robes Rouge,*" &c. 'X. The SOVEREIGN PONTIFF, with the same *TIARA*, and the same habiliments which he wore on the Eve of St. Peter. *He sat upon a RICH and MAGNIFICENT SEAT carried by eight Men in long RED ROBES,*' &c.

The same Author (*Motraye*) remarks that the *SEAT*, and *prodigious stretch of SPIRITUAL POWER* of the *ROMAN PONTIFF* was *such*, that it was *commonly said of Rome in his day*, that it had *gained by RELIGION*, that which it could not formerly conquer by *Arms*, as we may see by the verse following. The original words are from *Prosper*, Lib. de ingratis, Cap. 2.

'SEDES ROMA PETRI, quæ pastoralis honoris
Facta CAPUT mundo, quicquid non possidet Armis
RELIGIONE TENET.'

'Rome the See or *SEAT* of Peter, which is made to the world the *HEAD of Pastoral Honour*, *whatever it does not possess by ARMS, it holds by RELIGION.*'

¹ Voyages du Sr. Motraye, Tom. I. chap. i. page 4.

The same writer informs us, that the Pontiff ranks himself with *Emperors* as a *Temporal Prince*; but he places himself ABOVE them by the *Quality of a Spiritual Prince*, and this fact is practically acknowledged in WORDS and DEEDS—in WORDS by Pope¹ ‘LEO THE GREAT.’

‘*Per sacram D. Petri SEDem, Caput orbis effecta, (Roma) latius præsidet religione divinâ, quamvis enim multis aucta victoriis, Jus Imperii tui, terra marique protuleris, minus tamen est, quod tui bellicus labor subdidit, quam quod pax Christiana subjecit.*’ That is, ‘*By the holy See or SEAT of St. Peter (o Rome), thou being made the Head of the World, commandest further by divine Religion, than by earthly domination: for albeit, being augmented by many victories, thou hast extended the power of the Empire both by sea and land, yet that is less, which the labour of war hath subdued to thee, than that which Christian Peace hath brought under subjection.*’

In DEEDS, when they have literally *kicked the crown from the heads of* ²EMPERORS, and caused KINGS to stand barefoot at their gates, as in the cases of the *Emperor HENRY the VIth*, whose *crown Pope CELESTINE, with his foot, spurned from off his head*, to show, that it was in his power to take the Empire from him, and to pull off his crown; and of

¹ Leo Magnus, Sermon I. De Natali Apostolorum. See Durham on the Revelations, chap. xiii. page 562. Amsterdam, 1660.

² See ‘*The Buckler of the Faith*,’ by Peter du Moulin, from page 522 to 544; and ‘*Bishop Jewell’s Apology for the Church of England*,’ by Isaacson, page 270 to 276. 1829.

Henry the IVth of France : *King John* of England : *Henry* the IIInd, and *Prince Henry* the VIIIth : so that there is a complete coincidence between the words of *St. Paul* and *St. John*, in reference to the locality of the " GREAT CITY " and " *Temple of God*," in which this LATIN Papal MAN SITTETH, and to the unqualified power which he exerciseth, being no less than " ALL the POWER of the FIRST BEAST." Moreover, The pretended CHAIR of *St. Peter*, in which the *Sovereign Pontiff* SITS enthroned on the HIGH ALTAR in *St. Peter's Basilique*, when he is crowned, as well as when he receives adoration from *Emperors, Kings*, and their *Eminences the Cardinals*, &c. is so well known to all Europe as scarcely to need a remark. The French would say of the City and SEAT of the *Pope's jurisdiction* or dignity, ' *Le Saint SIÈGE*,' ' *Le SIÈGE de Rome*.' The Holy SEE or SEAT of Rome.' And *St. John* crowns the whole by saying that " THE DRAGON gave him his POWER, and his SEAT, and Great AUTHORITY."

It is an astonishing Fact, and scriptural coincidence, that the most magnificent of all the *Triple Crowns*, or *Papal Tiaras*, is one which was made by order of *Pope JULIUS* the IIInd, and that *Pope GREGORY* the XIIIth, removed the simple CROSS which was formerly upon the top of it, and replaced it by a most brilliant EMERALD, supported by two gold DRAGONS, causing his own Arms to be quartered therewith, and then placed his own Name and Title upon it in Letters of of Diamonds, after the following manner—

GREGOR. XIII. PONT. OPT. MAX.

So that the Title of 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS' '*The greatest Priest,*' was not a sufficient Title of distinction for Pope Gregory the XIII. but 'OPTIMUS,' 'THE BEST,' must be added, and then, as if the Papal Tiara were hitherto incomplete, *two gold DRAGONS* were placed on it, to give grandeur to the Diadem. In a word, WHEN *Pope Gregory* the XIIIth had removed the *simple CROSS*, and voluntarily placed two gold DRAGONS upon the top of his *Tiara*, and at the bottom placed *his own Name and Title in Letters of Diamonds*, and *quartered them with his Coat of Arms*, THEN he designated himself by the Title of 'PONTIFEX OPTIMUS MAXIMUS,' 'THE GREATEST AND BEST PRIEST.' Is not this an Heraldic and Hereditary, (I might say scriptural) acknowledgment of the SEAT of the DRAGON? of whom it is written that "The DRAGON gave him his Power, and his SEAT," (viz. ROME,) "and great Authority." A very large and splendid engraving of this TIARA may be seen in the *Voyages of the Sieur A. De La Motraye*, Vol. I. chap. ii. page 32. plate IV. than which no *Kingly Crown can be more magnificent*, if we may be allowed to judge from appearances. The following is the Court account of it as set forth by the *Sieur Motraye*, page 30.

'*La plus précieuse des THIARES fait par l'ordre de JULES II, Genoio de Nation, l'an 7me de son Pontificat, et représentée à la Planche IV, dont le fond est tout couvert de belles perles. Les cercles sont d'or*

battu : sur celui *du bas* sont le *Nom*, la *Dignité*, et la *Patrie* de ce *Pape* en *Lettres de Diamans*, en ces termes :—

‘ IVLIVS LIGVR II. PONTIFEX

MAXIMUS ANNO SEPTIMO PONTIFICATVS.

‘ Les autres sont admirablement bien *émailées* et garnies de *quantité de diamans*, de *rubis*, d’*emerauds*, d’*hyacintes*, de *saphirs* et de *topases*, et toutes en un ordre qui plaît beaucoup. Dans l’espace qui regne au dessus du cercle d’en bas, sont trois *escarboucles* admirable pour leur grandeur et leur éclat, avec un gros *saphir* très parfait, et un autre de même grandeur. Sur la partie opposée, il y a aussi çà et là diverses *perles* d’une grosseur extraordinaire, et de très belle eau, qui sont disposées avec une admirable simetrie, entre de gros *diamans*. Toutes les plus grosses pierreries sont d’ailleurs attachées en pendoques, ce qui leur donne un jeu qui augmente beaucoup leur éclat.

‘ *Sur le haut de cette Thiare*, où étoit auparavant une simple CROIX, regne une EMERAUDE d’une couleur parfaitement nette et vive, supportée par deux DRAGONS d’or, que Gregoire XIII. y fit mettre avec ses Armes et son Nom autour, en cette maniere :—

‘ GREGOR. XIII. PONT. OPT. MAX.

If the *Gold Dragons*, the *Enamel*, the *Diamonds*, the *Rubies*, the *Emeralds*, the *Hyacinths*, the *Sap-*

phires, the Topazes, the Carbuncles, the Pearls, which adorn the Papal Tiara: if 'the Pontifical Cope, made of fine RED or SCARLET STUFF, and worn by the Pope on the Eve of St. Peter, (the Titular Saint of Rome) with a rich Embroidery, and fastened by a kind of Hook or Buckle of Gold, called Pectoral, enriched with Precious Stones estimated at more than fifty thousand crowns:' if the scarlet colour of his Cardinals, as well as of the *Eight Men in long RED or SCARLET ROBES, who bear the 'Sedia Gestatoria,' and the Palfrey whereon the Pope rides, covered with scarlet cloth;* be not enough to illustrate to the very Letter, the words of the *Holy Spirit*—" ¹ *I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured Beast,*" and " *arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones,*"—in vain shall we search for the fulfilment of the words of St. John.

As therefore *St. John* has veiled the NAME of the *Beast* under an *Enigma*, but given us the Number $\chi\epsilon\varsigma'$, or 666, to discover it; so has he given us the *Interpretation* of the " *Seven Heads,*" which are " *Seven Mountains,*" (or ROME) to find the locality or SEAT of the KINGDOM of the *Beast*, from whence his NAME might be discovered, leaving it to the " *wisdom*" and " *understanding*" of which he speaks to apply the *Mystical Title* of " *BABYLON the GREAT*" to some *Ecclesiastical City*, the POTENTATE of which would be " ² *Revealed in his time*" at ROME, applicable to the whole scope of his Prophecy.

¹ Rev. xvii. 3, 4.

² 2 Thess. ii. 6.

And *such a MAN* is the *Pope of Rome*, for *no other Ecclesiastical POTENTATE, CITY, STATE, or KINGDOM, hath HITHERTO arisen answerable to the Prophecy*. Therefore, as the Apostle Paul wrote to the *Thessalonians*, that ¹“*the Mystery of Iniquity did already work,*” so also we may fairly conclude, that, as *Eighteen Centuries* have since rolled away, the “*Mystery of Iniquity*” has been *fully* “*REVEALED.*” And it is equally evident from *Roman History*, and the words of *Tertullian*, that the *then existence* of the *Roman Imperial Power* was the *preventing cause* which “*LET*” or “*WITHHELD*” the *Rise* of the “*Man of Sin,*” “*the Son of Perdition,*” “*the Mystery of Iniquity,*” “*the Wicked One,*” at *ROME*, even as *TERTULLIAN*, who lived in the *second century*, rightly *conjectured* concerning the *hidden Mystery* of *ANTICHRIST*, *before the fulfilment of the EVENT*, in these extraordinary words—
² ‘*Jam enim arcanum Iniquitatis agitatur, tantum qui nunc Tenet, Teneat; donec de medio fiat. QUIS, NISI ROMANUS STATUS? CUJUS ABSCESSIO in DECEM REGES dispersa ANTICHRISTUM superducet. Et TUNC REVELABITUR INIQUUS, quem Dominus Deus interficiet Spiritu Oris sui, et evacuabit, apparentiâ Adventus sui.*’ ‘*Even now indeed the Mystery of Iniquity is working; only He who now restrains, will restrain until he be taken out of the midst. What is this but the ROMAN STATE? the division of which among TEN KINGS will introduce ANTI-*

¹ Thess. ii. 7.

² Tertullian De Resurrect. Carnis. page 397. edit. Lutet.

CHRIST. And THEN *the Wicked One will be revealed*, whom the Lord God will slay with the Spirit of his Mouth, and destroy by the appearance of his coming.' How literally then has the EVENT followed the *Prediction* or *Conjecture*? as truly as if *Tertullian* had been an *Eye-witness* of the *Destruction of the Ancient Roman Imperial Power*, its subsequent *Division into Ten Kingdoms*, and the *Papacy* (the *Anti-christian Power*,) rising *supremely* above the whole. There is *nothing clearer in all History* than that the destruction of the PAGAN IMPERIAL, made way for the gradual *Rise and Establishment* of the PAPAL, PONTIFICAL, or ANTICHRISTIAN POWER, which continues at ROME to this Day. And as St. Paul speaks of " *the Man of Sin*," " *the Son of Perdition*," and " *Mystery of Iniquity*," as an *Ecclesiastical Character*, who " *SITTETH in the Temple of God*;" which is most clearly *fulfilled* in the PERSON of the *Papal* 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS' who SITTETH in the *superb* BASILIQUE of St. PETER'S at ROME; so the *Angel* said unto St. John: " I will tell thee the *Mystery of the Woman*, seated upon a *scarlet-coloured Beast*, having seven heads and ten horns. The Seven Heads, are *Seven Mountains* on which *the Woman sitteth*." And the *Angel* then says,¹ " The *Woman* which thou sawest is that GREAT CITY, which [NOW] *reigneth over the KINGS of the EARTH*;" the appellative of whose *forehead* is " MYSTERY, BABYLON the GREAT;" that is, the " GREAT CITY" before mentioned, the 'PURPLE'

¹ Rev. xvii. 18.

and 'SCARLET COLOUR' of which, are as literally NOW the *Royal Insignia* of PAPAL ROME, as they were in her *Imperial CÆSAR'S* time. So then¹ THE MYSTERY OF 'INIQUITY' is discovered by indisputable *Facts*, shadowed forth by the *Holy Scriptures*, and confirmed by *History*; and that which was ANTE *Eventum* with *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, is POST *Eventum* with *us*. By the same Rule, the MYSTERY of the² "1260 Days," or, "a *Time*, and *Times*, and *Half a Time*," has been proved, by the lengthened Reign of the *Papal ANTICHRISTS* in SUCCESSION, NOT to be LITERAL DAYS, as was supposed ANTE *Eventum*, but *prophetical Days*, or 1260 *years*, as is evident, POST *Eventum*, and this is precisely the view which IRENÆUS had of *Prophecy in general*, and which he has given us in these words,³ "*Omnis Prophetia, priusquam habeat efficaciam, ÆNIGMATA et AMBIGUITATES sunt hominibus. Cum autem venerit Tempus, et evenerit quod prophetatum est, tunc Prophetiæ habent Liquidam et certam Expositionem.*" All *Prophecy*, before it has its accomplishment, are RIDDLES and AMBIGUITIES unto Men: 'But when the *Time* is come, and that which was prophesied is come to pass, then have the *Prophecies* a CLEAR and CERTAIN EXPOSITION.' And as the *Character of ANTICHRIST* could not be exactly understood before he was revealed, only as far as other prophecies had been known in their fulfilment at the predicted time; so, to this

¹ Thess. ii. 7.² Rev. xii. 6, 14.³ IRENÆ. Advers. Hæres. lib. iv. cap. XLIII. p. 342, 343. Edit. Grabe.

purport *Christ*, in his instructions to his Disciples on the *Use of Prophecy*, says, ¹ “ And now I have told you *before* it come to pass, that, *when* it is come to pass, ye might believe.”

It is well known that until the *end* of the *third Century*, and even later, there was no “*falling away*” of the *old Roman Empire*, or of the *primitive Christian Church*; because during the existence of the *Pagan Imperial Sovereignty at Rome* we could scarcely expect the *Rise, Progress, and Establishment* of the *Papal Power*, and, accordingly, it did not begin to Rise till *after* the Removal of the *Ancient Imperial Seat of Government* from *Rome* to *Constantinople*. This is doubtless what is implied in the words of St. Paul,² “ NOW YE KNOW WHAT WITHHOLDETH that HE ” (‘ *the Man of Sin,* ’ ‘ *the Son of Perdition,* ’ ‘ *the Mystery of Iniquity,* ’ ‘ *the Wicked One,* ’) “ *might be Revealed in HIS TIME ;* ” for it was evidently the *continuance* of the *Imperial Power* in the City of Rome, which ‘ *withheld* ’ the *Revelation* of the “ *Man of Sin,* ” and, thereby, embarrassed the Judgment of *Irenæus*, and led him to *Conjecture* rather than *Determine* the NAME; because the EVENT, which is the *fulfilment of Prophecy*, had *not then come to pass*, and because in his Day there was no semblance of a LATIN OR ROMAN HIERARCH, OR SOVEREIGN PONTIFF in the *then visible Christian Church at Rome*, nor indeed till long *after his time*. Nevertheless, how literal has been the accomplishment of the extraordinary pro-

¹ John xiv. 29.

² 2 Thess. ii. 6.

phency under consideration ! for no sooner had the “ *falling away* ” of the *Empire* taken place, (called by Gibbon “ *the Decline, and Fall* ”) than it was presently followed by “ *a falling away* ” (ἡ ἀποστασία) in the *Christian Church*, and the *City of Rome* being vacated by the *Roman Emperor*, made way for *St. John’s second Beast*, which he saw¹ “ *coming up out of the EARTH* ; and HE had *two Horns* like a LAMB, and HE SPAKE as a DRAGON.” By the “ *EARTH* ” is evidently meant the *Roman EARTH*, because ROME was in *St. John’s time* called ‘ *SEPTI-COLLIS*,’ or ‘ *the CITY of SEVEN-HILLS*,’ and he says, “ *Here is the Mind which hath wisdom. The Seven Heads are Seven Mountains on which the Woman Sitteth.*” And the *Beast* which had “ *Two Horns like a LAMB* ” evidently means some *Ecclesiastical character* ; and every one knows that the word ECCLESIA (or CHURCH) is a *feminine Noun*, and that a *Woman* and a *Lamb* are *Symbolical* of a *Christian Church* and *Character* : but inasmuch as the “ *Two Horns like a Lamb* ” gave to the *Beast* the *external semblance of a LAMB* ; yet because he had also the “ *speech of a Dragon*,” we know that he is *not of Christian* but *ANTICHRISTIAN Origin*. Thus the *Pope of Rome*, although he honoureth himself with the *humble* and *mock Title* of ‘ *Servus Servorum Dei*,’ ‘ *Servant of the Servants of God*,’ yet is he much better known by his *supreme Titles* of ‘ *Sanc-tissimus Pater*,’ ‘ *Vicarius Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi in Terrá*,’ ‘ *Eminentissimus et Reverendissi-*

¹ Rev. xiii. 11.

mus Pater ac Dominus, ‘*Pater Principum et Regum: Rector Orbis,*’ ‘*Pontifex Optimus Maximus,*’ ‘*Episcopus Orbis,*’ ‘*Vice-Deo super Terram.*’ We know, therefore, that inasmuch as the *Pope* exerciseth the SUPREME POWER in a TEMPORAL KINGDOM; and that *Christ* said, “*My Kingdom is not of this world;*” and the *Pope* preacheth not the Gospel as *St. Peter* did, (according to the Commandment of *Christ*;) but “SITTETH,” (as it is written of him) “*in the Temple of God, shewing himself that HE IS GOD,*” by the divine ADORATION which he receiveth and requireth from ALL who approach him; of which the Pagan Roman Emperor CALIGULA’S was but a shadow; that we have thereby a full, ‘clear and certain exposition’ of all those marks which were predicted concerning him and his Kingdom, for they have literally “come to pass” in his Person and Office: hence, he who runneth may now read, and say, Behold! (in the *Mysterious Character of the Pope of Rome*), “the Man of Sin,” “The Son of Perdition,” “The Mystery of Iniquity,” The Wicked One, The “Antichrist,” even the “MAN,” whose Appellative Name is (from his universal Ecclesiastical and Canonical use of the LATIN Language,) *Λατῆνος*, and HIS NUMBER *ϞϞϞ*’ or 666.” It is moreover written concerning the Lamb-horned Beast, that, “HE exerciseth ALL the Power of the First” (Pagan Imperial Roman) “Beast,” whose¹ “IMAGE” he bears, and whose SUCCESSOR he is in the CITY of ROME, rather than of *St. Peter* the apostle of *Christ*,

¹ Rev. xiii. 14.

who, most probably, never entered the precincts of the *Latin Capital*. The POPE, I repeat, “ *exerciseth ALL the POWER of the FIRST BEAST* ” by his *Latin Papal Edicts, Anathemas, Bulls*, from the *Vatican: Denunciation* of all *Emperors, Kings, and Princes* who will not render him their *homage*: by the *Power of the Temporal Sword*: by the *Extirpation, Spoliation, Confiscation* of the *Persons and Properties* of those whom he is pleased to denominate *Heretics*, whom also he has punished with *all possible Tortures* by means of ‘ *the Holy Inquisition*; ’ by his murderous *Crusaders*; by the *Jesuits*; by the *Spanish Armada*; by the *St. Bartholomew’s Massacre*, and by a *continued course of Espionage and Popish Plots*. Who then is so fit a Character as the Pope to receive the combined Titles prophetically bestowed on the ‘ *Man of Sin*, ’ ‘ *the Son of Perdition*, ’ and the very ‘ *Antichrist* ’ to Perfection?

As the *Evidences* which can be produced in favour of retaining the NAME *Λατῆινος*, are so many and so great, it becomes our well-grounded alternative to abide by them, because the proper understanding of that Name of a MAN brands the whole *LATIN Church and Sovereign Pontifical Empire of Papal Rome*; and, therefore, to give up FIRST the *Authenticity* of the NUMBER *χξς*, or ‘ 666 ’ of *St. John*, and THEN the *Orthography of IRENÆUS and his Testimony*, without a due consideration and Investigation of the subject, opens the Flood-gates to our Enemies, by throwing down ONE of the most stupendous Bulwarks of defence against the influence of Popery

which has been discovered since the Apostolic Age, and which the good Providence of God has given us by the *Inspired Pen of St. John*, and his faithful servant *Irenæus*, who has followed in the steps of the Apostle. Thus, which way soever the CHURCH OF ROME may turn her *brazen front*, this LATIN “ MARK, NAME, and NUMBER, will cling to Her, till, ‘ *like a Mill-stone, She is cast into the Sea,*’ as it is written of Her, ¹ “ *BABYLON is fallen, is fallen, that GREAT CITY: and shall be FOUND NO MORE AT ALL.*”

Dr. FULKE in his ANNOTATIONS on REV. xiii. 18, has well answered the RHEIMISTS concerning the *Name of Antichrist*; for the Doctor has supported the Name *Λατῆινος*, (as used by IRENÆUS,) in a masterly manner, and he has shewn, that, in the JUDGMENT of IRENÆUS, it was as proper to apply the Name LATEINOS to the POPE as to the ROMAN EMPEROR, which may serve as a LESSON to those Authors, who have invented FEIGNED NAMES, which are nothing to the Purpose of the MARK or NAME of the MAN, but only productive of UNCERTAINTY; which is no furtherance to the understanding of the *Number 666*.

‘ ANTICHRIST’S NAME.’

² ‘ REV. xiii. 18. THE NUMBER 666. It is true that MANY NAMES may be INVENTED, whose LETTERS

¹ REV. xviii. 2, 10, 21.

² FULKE 10.

make THIS NUMBER, but the SPIRIT of GOD speaketh not of FEIGNED NAMES, nor biddeth men to FAINE NAMES that have THIS NUMBER in it, for THEREOF can come nothing but UNCERTAINTIE. But he willeth him to compt the Number of his Name, which THEN the BEAST HAD: which NAME many of the faithful BEFORE IRENÆUS' time JUDGED to be *Λατῆινος*: And IRENÆUS, affirmeth that "*it was very like to be so indeed, because the most true Kingdome hath that name. For they be Latines*" (saith he) "*which now do Raigne, lib. 5.*" By which we note FIRST that HIS JUDGMENT was, that ANTICHRIST should be NO SINGULAR MAN, but an ORDER and SUCCESSION of MEN. SECONDLY, that THE BEAST THEN REIGNED in the HEATHEN EMPERORS which AFTERWARDS SHOULD REIGNE IN ANTICHRIST. The Toy of LUTHER's Name is worthy to be laughed at, seeing it is no hard matter to drawe any Man's name almost to it: IF you may CHANGE the LETTERS at your pleasure, and take upon you to know a Man's Name better than himselfe. But you say it is *most absurd folly to apply the word Lateinos to the Pope*. And why so I pray you, is not HE a LATINE, as well as the ROMANE EMPEROUR? Your reason is, that neither the whole ORDER, nor any PARTICULAR POPE was so called. For any particular POPE we strive not, but is not the POPE HEAD of the LATINE CHURCH, as the EMPEROUR was of the LATINE EMPIRE? Therefore IF the EMPEROUR might be CALLED LATINOS, (by IRENÆUS' JUDGMENT) much more the POPE,

who is so MUCH a LATIN, that HE will allow no exercise of Religion, BUT in LATINE. That HE CONDEMNEETH the GREEK CHURCH, because it will not be SUBJECT to HIS LATINE LAW. Which hath caused all private men to PRAY in LATINE. Which alloweth no TRANSLATION of the SCRIPTURE as AUTHENTICALL, BUT HIS LATINE, NO NOT the ORIGINALL of HEBRUE *and* GREEKE, which he blasphemeth to be CORRUPTED: and, therefore, MUST GIVE PLACE TO HIS LATINE. Insomuch that THE SETTER FORTH of the COMPLUTENSE EDITION, in his PREFACE to him, saith, “ HE placed the LATINE TEXT BETWEEN the HEBREW and the GREEK, as CHRIST between Two thieves.” Finally, when it is so notorious that HE is the HEAD of the LATINES, that the ignorant people knowe no other proper difference of HIS RELIGION, but that IT IS LATINE. That IRENÆUS applied THAT NAME to the STATE of the HEATHEN EMPEROURS, IT WAS RIGHT, for THEN the SIXTH KING REIGNED; and ANTICHRIST the SEVENTH HEAD of the LATINE BEAST WAS NOT COME, as HE IS NOW seen in the PAPACIE. That he preferreth the Name TEITAN, it was because he SAWE NOT the FULFILLING of the PROPHECIE in the COMING of ANTICHRIST, the accomplishment whereof, he willed men to WAITE FOR, that they BE NOT DECEIVED by the CONJECTURES of DIVERS NAMES. But NOW that ANTICHRIST IS COME and DISCOVERED, we SEE PLAINELY that LATEINOS IS HIS NAME. Yea, we SEE that רומיית, the HEBREW NAME of the BEAST signifying ROMANE, hath the SAME

NUMBER : and it is NOT BY CHANGE that ECCLESIA ITALICA in the ACCOUNT of the GREEKE LETTERS, FULFILLETH the SAME NUMBER.'

It was the avowed opinion of Pope GREGORY, that 'whosoever should style himself by the Title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP, would be ANTICHRIST,' and this is the self-adopted Title of the Pope of Rome, viz. 'EPISCOPUS ORBIS,' 'BISHOP of the WORLD,' and 'PONTIFEX OPTIMUS MAXIMUS,' 'The BEST and GREATEST HIGH PRIEST,' &c.

Thus then have we discovered by Papal Testimony, that,

The UNIVERSAL BISHOP is ANTICHRIST ;

But the POPE of ROME is THE UNIVERSAL BISHOP :

Therefore the POPE of ROME is ANTICHRIST.

Thus have we caught this *Lamb-horned Ecclesiastical Beast*, 'The UNIVERSAL BISHOP,' with his *dragon-like speech*, at Rome, where his *Sovereign Pontifical THRONE* and *SEAT of EMPIRE* have been fixed for '1260 DAYS of Years,' commencing with the Reign of *Justinian*, A. D. 533, and let him extricate himself from our grasp if he can ; but no ; his NAME is *Numbered*, his TIME OF CONTINUANCE is NUMBERED, and the PLACE OF HIS ABODE is NUMBERED, and his *Pseudo-Apostolic Reign* is now too short to deceive the Nations of the World any longer as to who or what he is ; for the same "Kings" of the *Pseudo-Apostolic Roman Earth*, who "gave power" to this *Sovereign Pontifical Tyrant of Christendom*, are to take it away from him, as *England, France, Germany, &c.* have done

already, and *Spain, Portugal, and Italy*, with the Remaining Crowned Heads of Papal Europe will do: for His Hour seems well nigh come.

We may then rest satisfied, from the consideration of a succession of unparalleled EVENTS which have taken place on the *platform* of the *old and new Roman Earth*, beginning with the Days of the Apostles, that *St. John* in the *xiiiith Chapter of his Revelation*, (ver. 1 and 11,) has, under the character of *two Beasts*, (*the one Secular, the other Ecclesiastical and Secular*,) figuratively described the *two-fold Empire* of the most cruel Tyrants and Persecutors of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, *sitting and ruling in the same City, ROME ancient and modern*; the *first Beast* on the *Pagan Imperial Throne*: the *second* on the *Sovereign Pontifical Throne*, the latter of which has been well described as '*Imperium in Imperio*,' '*An Empire within an Empire*;' and most commentators are agreed that the *first* of these Beasts represents the *Pagan Roman Empire* with its *Emperors*, as *Nero, Domitian, &c*: and the *Second* the *Sovereign Ecclesiastical Empire* and its *Popes*, known and distinguished by the Epithets of '*The Papal States*' and '*The States of THE CHURCH*:' also '*Sacra Romana Ecclesia*,' '*The Holy Roman Church*,' and '*Sanctum Romanum Imperium*,' '*The Holy Roman Empire*:' which *Holy Roman Church and Empire*, we discover in the very *same City and Kingdom of Pagan Imperial Rome*, and continuing unto this Hour, of which *Church and Empire* the Pope of Rome is the *Sove-*

reign Pontiff. And because the **LATIN Language** has been approved by the *Pope and his Councils* as the *sacred Language of the whole Church of Rome*, and has been *Canonized for her use*, at the *Council of Trent*, in lieu of the **ITALIAN**, which is the *Vernacular Tongue of ITALY*, or of the **GREEK**, which is the *Mother Tongue of the Primitive Church of Christ and his Apostles* ; consequently, as the *Papacy Latinizes in every thing of an Ecclesiastical nature* ; viz. *Mass, Prayers, Hymns, Liturgies, Canons, Decretals, Bulls, Councils, Holy Scriptures, &c. &c.* : so is *that Church*, in the *proper sense of the word*, a **LATIN CHURCH**, and by parity of Reasoning the **POPE**, as the **HEAD of that LATIN CHURCH**, is a **LATIN Church MAN**, answerably to his **LATIN TONGUE**. *Irenæus* then was not far out of the Track when he conjectured the *Name of the Beast to be* *Λατῆϊνος*. For the Reason which he assigned for that Conjecture is, "**LATINI sunt qui NUNC regnant** ;" which statement was *at that time* perfectly correct, because it is the *Name of the first Pagan Roman Beast* to whom the *Number belonged* ; but is *now appropriated* to the *Second Papal Roman Beast*, who is the *veritable "IMAGE," Representative, and Successor of the first Beast* ; inasmuch as it may be said, in an Ecclesiastical sense, that "*They are LATINS who NOW Reign* ;" for in the *19th Century*, the *Church of Rome* vaunts herself to be the *true Christian Church throughout the world*, and yet *contrary to all precedent* has adopted the **LATIN Vulgate** to the exclusion of the *Vernacular*

Tongue of Italy, or the GREEK original. Behold, then, the self-infatuation of the “*Man of Sin*,” “*the Son of Perdition!*” Behold with Astonishment the “*Mystery of Iniquity!*” who can unravel the *Mystery* of the “MAN?” Why, *his own* LATIN SPEECH, by *self-adoption* and infatuated appropriation, “*bewrayeth HIM*,” that HE is the MAN, even the LATIN BISHOP of ROME: HE, *The MAN*, whose descriptive “MARK,” Appellative “NAME,” and enigmatical “Number,” are all LATIN; (to wit LATEINOS). Thus has he *locked up the HOLY SCRIPTURES* in the LATIN (*unknown, or unspoken*) Tongue, authorizing it to be the Living Vernacular Tongue of his *Latin, Papal, Roman Church and Kingdom*. Wherefore, we have an indisputable Right to *designate* him by that *Proper and Appellative Name*, (*Lateinos*), which he alloweth to be *Ecclesiastically and Canonically true*, as his *Council of Trent* witnesseth. Or why doth the Pope so scrupulously adhere to the *Latin dead Language*, seeing that it has not been spoken in all Europe for Centuries past? And here I would by the way remark that the *sense* in which, during the times of *Ancient Rome* its *Pagan Rulers* were termed LATIN EMPERORS, may fairly apply, with an *improved significancy* to the *Sovereign Pontiffs* of the *Ecclesiastical Roman Empire*; for the EMPERORS of ROME *spake* LATIN as their native Language, but the *Popes*, centuries after it has ceased to be spoken either in ITALY or EUROPE, have commanded ALL PAPISTS to have the formularies of their *Church Service* in none other

Language than LATIN, throughout the world, therefore, the PAPISTS are, to all intents and purposes, LATINS by self-appropriation, and are living witnesses to the Mysterious Fact.

As the NEW TESTAMENT of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was *originally written in GREEK, (and not in Latin,)* what *Scriptural Argument of Commandment can be advanced by this Mystical, Latin, Pontifical, Roman MAN, and that of his Councils, for the promulgation of the Holy Scriptures throughout the world in the LATIN Language?* Is it not in truth permitted by Providence, that by this SPECIAL, this *adopted, this branded LATIN "MARK" of Mystical and Ecclesiastical Distinction, this self-appropriated LATIN Language, Christians might be able, after the full Revelation and Establishment of the Popedom, to trace the "Man of Sin," the "Son of Perdition" the "Mystery of Iniquity," to ROME?* and *thence propound from the Volume of Inspiration, as compared with the clearest historical Facts, that from the aggregate Evidence of his Mystical Character, and most Mystical use of the LATIN Tongue in the ROMAN CHURCH, HE might merit the Proper and Appellative Name LATEINOS, as the Founder of a NEW KINGDOM on the Ruins of old Rome, and as reviving the old Latin Language, and using the Papal Cæsarean Title of "PONTIFEX MAXIMUS" which is engraven on his MITRE and TRIPLE CROWN, as also the introduction of various Pagan Customs and Ceremonies into his Roman Basilique. Plain then indeed, is the Evidence that*

to the *Roman* or *Latin Pontiff*, whose entire *Ecclesiastical Language* is *LATIN*, this *Latin imprinted* "MARK," "NAME, and NUMBER 666" belong, because it is a *Name most descriptive of his character, Sovereign Pontifical Empire, and LATIN Apostate (not Apostolic) Church of Rome.*

If *ANTIQUITY* be any thing, (and this Point the *Roman Catholics* esteem of *special importance*,) if the *Holy Scriptures* must of *Imperative Necessity* be promulgated in some *ONE Particular Language*, then of course the *GREEK ORIGINAL* would take precedence of the *LATIN Vulgate*, which latter is only a *Translation*, as the *Romanists* well know. Moreover, no *Scriptural argument* can be adduced by the *Pope* and his *College of Cardinals*, why the *Holy Scriptures* should be circulated through the whole world in the *LATIN Language*, rather than the *Greek original*: for neither *Christ*, the *Evangelists*, nor any of the *inspired Apostles*, have left us any such commandment in the *Gospel*, and the *Latin Language* has not been spoken by any one *Nation, Kingdom, or People, in any City, or Town, or Province in all Europe* for centuries past, no, not even in *Italy, Latium, or ROME*, the *SEAT* of the *Roman* or *Latin 'Pontifex Maximus.'* Wherefore, as notwithstanding the *LATIN* has been adopted and canonized by the *Popish Councils* for the sole uses of the *Roman Church*, and is the *Living Universal Language* of that Church among all the *Nations of Europe* at this hour; so she bears, as a *Stigma* incurred by such adoption and canonization, the

LATIN NAME *branded upon her* CHURCH and KINGDOM, and it will anathematize Her to all future generations. For though she has the consummate impudence and affrontery to style Herself *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and exclusively, THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, yet is she *not Catholic in any other sense than from the Catholic use of the Latin Language throughout her Latin Communion.*

What, I would ask, becomes of the great intent of the *Pentecostal gift of Tongues*—viz. That ¹“EVERY MAN might hear in his own Tongue or Language, wherein he was born, the wonderful works of God;” if the *Holy Scriptures* were intended to be locked up, and exclusively circulated in the *Latin Tongue*? Where, then, is the obedience of this *Latin Church of Rome* and its members to the emphatical injunction of our Lord, ²“Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of ME?” How in the breast of a *Roman Catholic*, can that noble spirit, which characterized the *Bereans*, expand and grow? Of whom we read, that they ³were “more noble than those in *Thessalonica*, in that they” “searched the Scriptures daily?”

¹ Acts ii. 7—11.² John v. 39.³ Acts xvii. 11.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GENERAL ARGUMENT FOR THE NAME *Λατῆινος*
AS DEFINITELY AND EXCLUSIVELY DESCRIPTIVE
OF THE “MAN OF SIN,” FURTHER CONFIRMED.

ST. PAUL'S observations relative to *speaking* in an “*unknown Tongue*” “*in the Church*” are worthy of especial notice, inasmuch as they summarily and beyond appeal condemn the *Opinions* and *Decisions* of the *Papal Council of Trent*, and pronounce the *Doom* of *such an Heretical Council*.¹ “I thank my God,” said St. Paul, “I speak with TONGUES *more than ye all*: yet IN THE CHURCH *I had rather speak FIVE WORDS with my understanding*, that by my voice I might teach others also, than *ten thousand words* in an UNKNOWN TONGUE.” What, however, is the LATIN, but an “UNKNOWN TONGUE” *in every part of Europe, and even in ROME itself*?

It is well worthy of remark that although there are *millions* of individuals belonging to *each* of the

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

three following apostate Churches ; viz. the JEWISH, GREEK, and MOHAMMEDAN, and although the two former of these Churches were prior in ANTIQUITY to Papal Rome, yet not one of them has, at any period since the commencement of the Christian Æra, imperiously required the Religion they profess to be promulgated in the LATIN Language ; nor has either the Jewish or Greek Church, though persecuted by the Papal power, ever consented to the ‘ Council of Trent,’ in reference to the adoption of the Latin Language. Oh no ! LATIN is the peculiar characteristic MARK of the Papal Roman Church, and she shall have the proper Name Λατῆνικος, as her deservedly imprinted Stigma and Character. St. Paul having also denounced those who spake in an “ unknown Tongue ” “ in the Church,” it may thence be inferred that the CHURCH OF ROME is NOT the TRUE CHRISTIAN CHURCH to which the Apostle addressed his Epistles ; but the spurious offspring of the Roman Apostolical Church after the ¹ “ FALLING AWAY ” of the true Church (and old Roman Empire,) being now mixed up with Jewish Ceremonies, Pagan Idolatry, Heresies, Blasphemies, as set forth in her Latin Books of Dogmas, Missals, &c. &c. She has also by her Latin Papal Bulls and Edicts, in Ecclesiastical Affairs, and by the ‘ forbidding to Marry, and commanding to abstain from Meats,’ excluded herself from the common Rights and Privileges of Christianity, and ² “ seared her conscience with a hot iron,” the imprinting of which can never

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3.

² 1 Tim. iv. 2.

be obliterated but by *her Destruction*, which, *at its greatest distance, must be near at hand*. She must therefore carry on her forehead, not only the *Pagan Imperial Title* of 'PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,' but also the *indelible MARK* of her *Mystical Name*, LATÉINOS, until, like *Babylon of Old*, she has "filled up the Measure of her Iniquity," and is "cast into the sea:" and, oh, what tribulation, anguish, and wrath must await her for her *bloody 'INQUISITION,' Tyranny*, and *matchless Persecutions*, and for having dared to *Lock up the Holy Bible*, the *Book of God*, in an "unknown Tongue," or dead Language, by which procedure she has *taken away the*¹ "KEY OF KNOWLEDGE" from the *Common People of all the Countries of Europe*. Give ear then, O Christian, to the MIGHTY CONTRAST between the great *Apostle St. Paul*, who was a truly *Inspired Man*, and who wrote most of the *Epistles of the New Testament* to GENTILE Christian Churches, whose Labours, Dangers and Sufferings are set forth in the *Acts of the Apostles!* and the great *Papal Pseudo-Apostolic Roman*, or *Latin*, "*Man of Sin*," who is seated at Rome, and whose HEAD is adorned *not only with an Episcopal Mitre*, but also with a TRIPLE CROWN; and who, instead of *writing to the distant Churches in his Communion*, *Epistles of*² "*Grace, Mercy, and Peace, from Jesus Christ*," (whose 'VICAR upon EARTH' he professes to be,) sends out of his *Treasure House*, the VATICAN PALACE, at ROME, his *thundering Bulls*, and *Anathemas* to the

¹ Luke xi. 52.² 1 Tim. i. 2.

Crowned Heads of Europe, and to all subjects within their Dominions, who will not acknowledge *Him* as the *Liege Sovereign Pontiff* of the *Latin Earth*, which extends over the *Old* and *New World*, denouncing all such as *Heretics*, who are to be *Deposed*, *Excommunicated*, their property *Confiscated*, and themselves *burnt* or *tortured* by *Inquisitors* of the “*HOLY INQUISITION*.”

It is well known that though the *Greek Septuagint Translation* of the *Hebrew Bible*, completed in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, was *never commanded* by *God*, or any of his *servants the Prophets* to be *received* by the *Gentile Nations* as the *Standard Version* of the *Old Testament*; yet it was in truth the most authentic of all *Translations* extant of the *Hebrew Text*, and is often *quoted* by *Christ* and his *Apostles* in the *Greek Testament*: there was, therefore, *as much authority* for the *adoption* and *general use* of the *Greek Septuagint Translation* for the *Gentiles*, under the *Mosaical Dispensation*, as there is for the *Latin Vulgate Translation* under the *Christian Dispensation*, which in fact *amounts to none at all*. There have been at least *SEVEN* different *Papal Revisions* of the *Latin Vulgate*, and the *last* is *worse than the first*, to say nothing of the numerous *corruptions* introduced by the *Papists* themselves into the *TEXT* to support their *Dogmas*, which are set forth in *two thick volumes octavo*, besides *mistranslations*, *omissions*, &c. Indeed it is most remarkable that between the *two editions* of *Pope SEXTUS* the *Vth.* and *CLEMENT* the *VIIIth* there are about 2000

different Readings. [See a Work entitled ‘*BELLUM PAPALE, sive Concordia Discors SIXTI QUINTI, et CLEMENTIS OCTAVI circa Hieronymianam Editionem. Auctore Thoma James Novi Collegii in Alma Academia Oxoniensi socio, et utriusque Academiæ in Artibus Magistro. Londini, 1678.*]

The *Books* called APOCRYPHA, (although they pertain to the *History of the Jewish wars, &c. &c.*, and have many things excellent in them,) have *never been found* in the HEBREW LANGUAGE, but *only in the GREEK*, and *some of them only in LATIN* : they were *never received by the JEWS themselves into the CANON of HOLY WRIT* ; and are acknowledged by them to be APOCRYPHAL ; yet they are *now fully admitted* among the CANONICAL BOOKS of the OLD TESTAMENT by the LATIN apostate CHURCH of ROME, upon *no better authority than that of the POPE and his pretended infallible Councils*. In this point then the ROMANISTS have *outstripped the JEWS* in HERESY by rendering *those Books CANONICAL* under the CHRISTIAN, which were *always accounted APOCRYPHAL* under the MOSAICAL DISPENSATION.

It will be clearly seen from what has been said by *St. John* in the *Book of Revelations* (Chap. xiii. 11th and 18th verses.) compared with *historical Evidence* of the clearest nature, that the *Apostle* has not led us *vaguely to seek for the mystical NAME of the MAN*, whose *Number* is 666, either *among the JEWS, GREEKS, or MOHAMMEDANS* ; because, there is *not a sufficiency of Sovereign ECCLESIASTICAL IDENTITY* in any *one* of them with reference to the

proper Name of the Beast, or the *Locality* of his *mystical Kingdom*; his *character*; or the *extreme power* and *authority* with which the second or Papal Beast, (who is the *SUCCESSOR* of the *first* or *Pagan Roman Beast*) is said to *Rule*; who, though he was to “*come up out of the EARTH*;” that is, from a *low* and *obscure state*, was nevertheless to “*exercise ALL THE POWER OF the FIRST BEAST* :” that is, *Supreme Power* and *Dominion*, accompanied with *matchless tyranny* towards all Christians, even surpassing his Predecessors, the *Pagan Roman Emperors*, who were unquestionably the *First Beast*. (Rev. xiii. 1—11.) Therefore, till we have decidedly found some *matchless Ecclesiastical MAN*, whose universally acknowledged character is answerable to the whole portraiture drawn of Him by *St. Paul* and *St. John*, it will be useless to attempt to *determine* the *Appellative Name* of the *Numbered Beast*. But as *Ecclesiastical Rome* has¹ “*Lorded it over God’s heritage*” for upwards of *twelve centuries* past, in the most astounding manner *in the face* and *defiance of all Europe*, contrary to the commands of Christ, and the Apostolic Injunction of *St. Peter*, whose veritable Successor the Pope professes to be, though it is manifest enough, by such usurpation, that *He* is the *Successor* of *SIMON MAGUS*; and the words of *Christ* are made void, who said to his own Disciples,² “*My kingdom is not of this world* ;” “*now is my Kingdom not from hence*.” The *Pope* has thus set up an *Earthly Kingdom* at *ROME*, and

¹ 1 Peter v. 3.² John xviii. 36.

instead of¹ *feeding Christ's Sheep and Lambs*, (which was the *special and last charge given to St. Peter*,) *He*, with his² *'Dragon Mouth,'* has devoured both *Sheep and Lambs* by horrible *Tortures* of his *Infernal "INQUISITION ;"* by his *Crusades* against the *Waldenses and Albigenses* : his bloody *Massacres* of the *Protestants* in the *Netherlands* by the command of the *Duke of Alva* ; the *Papal Massacres* in *France, England, Germany and Ireland* : his *persecution of the Huguenots* : his attempted *invasion of England* by the *Spanish Armada* : the *Gunpowder Plot*, with a thousand untold horrors too awful to relate, and therefore it was that *St. John* said :³ " *I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus,*" &c.

If *Rome Pagan* has slain her thousands of *Martyrs*, *Rome Papal* has slain her *tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands*. The *Inquisition* has *destroyed* about *three Millions*. *St. John* expressed no astonishment at the *persecutions of the first Roman Beast*, because it was *Pagan* ; but when he beheld the "*scarlet coloured Beast*," who is the *Beast with two Horns*, "*like a Lamb* ;" and a *professed Ecclesiastical Power persecuting the Church of Christ*, it is said that the *Apostle* "*wondered with great admiration*. And the *Angel* said unto him, *Wherefore didst thou Marvel ? I will tell thee the Mystery of the Woman*." " *Here is the mind which hath wisdom*. The *Seven Heads*

¹ John xxi. 15—17.² Rev. xiii. 11.³ Rev. xvii. 6.

are seven *Mountains on which the woman sitteth* :” which have been proved to denote ROME.

Although Mr. Faber and others have exerted all their talents to establish such words as ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ, &c., and to *subvert* the *orthography of Irenæus* in his *twofold* use of the *Diphthong*, or *broad ει* or *ϝ*, they have nevertheless failed in both attempts. Thus the *Appellative Name* Λατῆινος stands forth pre-eminent to our view, for it is answerable in every way to the “MARK,” the “NAME,” the “NUMBER,” the CHARACTER, the LANGUAGE, the SEAT and the ECCLESIASTICAL KINGDOM of the “MAN,” who is the *Sovereign Hierarch of Rome*, and (by *self-assumption*) of the WORLD. The history of all this may be found to range within the SEE or CITY of modern PAPAL ROME, or MYSTIC BABYLON, where indeed this *Sovereign Ecclesiastical Latin Pontifical MAN*, has most imperiously *seated himself* in the *superb Basilique*, or “*Temple of God*” at Rome, called after the *Name of St. Peter* ; there *shewing himself to all the Potentates of Europe* that *He sits a King* confessed . . . a *Divinity* . . . a *God* . . . as St. Paul characterizes *his Exaltation*, and that in a vast variety of ways by *requiring from all his subjects*, whether *high or low, rich or poor, learned or unlearned* ; the most servile homage and genuflexion,¹ even from *Emperors, Kings, Princes, Nobles, &c. &c.*, as members of his Latin Church ! We have only to revert to such instances as those of HENRY the IV. of *France* . . . KING JOHN of *England* . . .

¹ See ‘the Buckler of the Faith, by Peter Du Moulin,’ p. 542 to 544.

and the *Emperor* HENRY the VIth, whose Crown *Pope Celestine* with his *foot* spurned from off his head, to shew that it was in his power to take the Empire from him, and to pull off his crown, &c. Also, their *Eminences*, the *Cardinals*, and all others under his *Ecclesiastical authority*, profoundly bend and *Kiss the Foot* of this Papal Idolatrous Latin "*Man*;" and then, as if the Godhead were in him, this wicked '*Pontifex Maximus*' pretends to have absolute power to forgive sins, which, agreeably to His assumed *Infallibility* and *Universal Episcopal Authority*, he exercises with a high and mighty hand by the sale of plenary *Indulgences* all over the world to *Individuals* whom he *never saw*, nor is ever likely to see. Whereas, *St. Peter*, the true Apostle of *Christ*, would not allow his foot to be kissed, nor his body worshipped by *Cornelius*, the centurion, who when he met *Peter*,¹ "fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, "*Stand up; I myself also am a Man.*" So the *Angel* refused to be worshipped by *St. John*, to whom he had just delivered the *Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ*.² "And I, John, saw these things and heard them; and when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel which shewed me these things. Then said he unto me, *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren, the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this Book: WORSHIP GOD:*" from which words we may conclude that the *Pope* is

¹ Acts x. 25, 26.² Rev. xxii. 8, 9; xix. 10.

neither the true follower, nor exemplar, nor successor of St. Peter or St. John, because he has assumed to himself the Right of divine worship, which Peter refused from Cornelius, and the Angel from St. John.

As Christ never entrusted any One of the *Twelve Apostles* with more power than another as to the *forgiveness of Sins*; so neither did he set apart St. Peter, (the Pope's pretended Predecessor,) to that special office: nor did He choose him as the *Chief of the Apostles*. This may be inferred from the following words:¹—"And the *Apostles* who were at JERUSALEM" (not ROME) "hearing that SAMARIA had received the Word of God, SENT to them PETER and JOHN." Here then we perceive that the *Apostles collectively* had power to send both Peter and John from Jerusalem to Samaria to those converts who "had received the Word of God," and from the obedience of Peter we know that he was no Pope; because he would in that case have sent other Apostles from Jerusalem; and would have continued in that City himself as the CHIEF Apostle. Besides, Peter has most solemnly condemned what the Popes have openly allowed, viz. the unbounded sale of Indulgences as the supposed pardon and absolution of men's sins. For it was Simon Peter who said to Simon the "Magician," and dealer in sorcery and witchcraft.² "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast THOUGHT that the GIFT of God may be purchased with money." Now what is the "forgiveness of

¹ Acts viii. 14.

² Acts viii. 20.

sins” but the “*gift of God*” through Jesus Christ? as well as the other *gift of the Holy Ghost*? Are they not *both of them mentioned together* in these words of *St. Peter*? ¹“ Then *Peter* and the other Apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to GIVE *repentance* to Israel, and *forgiveness of sins*. And we are *his witnesses* of these things; and so also is the *Holy Ghost*, whom God hath GIVEN to them that obey him.” Numerous other Texts might be adduced to the same purpose.

Wherefore, we may rest assured that if *Simon the magician* was so greatly condemned by *St. Peter* for the expression alone of the THOUGHT which was in his heart of purchasing the GIFT of God with money, that the Apostle declared he had “*neither part nor lot in this Matter*;” with how much heavier condemnation would the same Apostle have pronounced an irrevocable Sentence on the Popes, the pretended Vicars of Christ, for their infamy in selling *Indulgences* and the pardon of men’s sins by wholesale, at a Market-price, over all the world, whereby he maketh Merchandize of men’s souls and they are cast into Perdition? Is not the Appellative of the Pope, therefore, rightly signified by the “*Man of Sin*,” “*the Son of Perdition*,” “*the Mystery of Iniquity*,” “*the Wicked One*?” But

¹ Acts v. 29—32.

we notice that it was for the exercise of the *Divine Right* in the *forgiveness of sins* that *Christ* was *stoned* and *afterwards put to Death* by the *Jews*, for they said, “How doth *this Man* thus speak *blasphemies*: who can forgive sins but God only?” And if the *Jews* considered it *Blasphemy* in “the *Man Christ Jesus*,” who, as the “*Son of Man*” had “*power on Earth to forgive sins* ;” and evidenced his *High and Divine Commission* by a *public exhibition* of his *Miracles* in *attestation of the Truths which he taught*, what shall we say to this vile *Papal Impostor*, this *Antichrist*, this *Man of Sin*, this *Son of Perdition*, this *Mystery of Iniquity*? Shall we not say, without hesitation, that this *Latin Papal Roman Man* speaketh *BLASPHEMIES*? Yea, verily, we fear not to charge upon the *Pope* and the *conclave of his Latin Cardinals* confederate, with the whole *College of Jesuits*, the *blood of Saints and Martyrs for Jesus’ sake*, whose *blood crieth from the ground* for that vengeance which will shortly be awarded to this ¹ “*Man of Sin*,” “whom the *Lord* shall consume with the *Spirit of his mouth*, and shall destroy with the *brightness of his coming*.”

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3, 8.

CHAPTER XVIII.

ROMANISM SUMMARILY CONFRONTED WITH HOLY SCRIPTURE.

IT was a common saying of old, ‘ *Ubi Imperator, ibi Roma,*’ ‘ *Where the Emperor is, there is Rome;*’ and can we not with *equal propriety* say at *this time*, *Ubi Papa, ibi Roma?* ‘ *Where the Pope is, there is Rome?*’ Yes, indeed; for nothing can be clearer than that the *Proper and Appellative Name* *Λατῆινος* most fully unfolds the whole secret of the Mystical Enigmatical Number *χξς’*, or 666, and brings us into acquaintance with the ¹ “ *wisdom*” and “ *understanding*” of which *St. John* speaks, and of which we have been in search. To this we have now attained in the most satisfactory and unequivocal manner, insomuch that it may be truly affirmed that there is *none other Name of a MAN* so suitably *descriptive* of, and *Identical with*, the *Roman Sovereign Pontiff*, who *Latinizes* in every *Ecclesiastical*

¹ Rev. xiii. 18.

Matter. Moreover, if the *adjective Roman* be subtracted from that of *Catholic*, we might be in some little difficulty about the manner of appropriating the *Latin Name* to the *Roman Sovereign Pontiff*, because the *term Catholic* would apply to the *Universal Church of Christ* upon Earth, wheresoever dispersed, the *term Catholic* being a *universal Term*; but by the *retention* of the *adjunct* 'ROMAN' (as the *Papists themselves have acted by reviving the use of the old Latin Tongue*,) we have *thereby* both the *identity* and *limit* of this *Roman, Latin, Italian, or Mystic Babylonish Church*. Doubtless she herself has given us *her own proper* and *approved Appellations* in these words, 'Sacra ROMANA Ecclesia,' and 'Sanctum ROMANUM Imperium,' and, therefore, as she has styled herself by the *Titles* of the 'Holy ROMAN Church,' and the *Holy ROMAN Empire*, (which is 'Imperium in Imperio,) and that the *Latin vulgate* is the *canonized Mother Tongue* of the aforesaid *Roman Church*, so the *Appellative Name* Λατῆνος, Lateinos, is engraved upon her *Battlements*, and the *Hebrew word* רומיית, Romiith, which likewise contains the *Number 666*, confirms the *signature*, which *cannot* be obliterated by all the *sophistry* of the whole *Order of Jesuits*, or the *thunders of the Vatican* itself.

Having fully established the *orthography of Irenæus* concerning the *Diphthong* ει or ϝ; and shown the strict propriety of *retaining the Name* Λατῆνος in preference to all *Indefinite* and *inappropriate Titles, Sentences, or Names of Men*, I must now leave the

subject to the calm and impartial consideration of my Readers, as to whether *any other* NAME has been *conjectured*, or can be found equally appropriate to the *terms of the Prophecy*. And I fear not the Result, with reference to this “STRONG-HOLD” against *Romanism*, the *wisdom* and *understanding* of which *St. John* speaks, being to find the *Name of a Man*, producing by the *individual LETTERS of the Name*, the *true Number* 666: as also his *descriptive* “MARK,” all of which harmonize in the *Name* LATEINOS, and, therefore, to set aside the *Proper, descriptive, and Appellative Name* Λατῆινος, as the *Rev. Mr. Faber, Dr. Adam Clarke, &c.*, have done, by rejecting the Orthography and Testimony of *Father Irenæus*, and as *Professor Lee* has done by insinuating an *uncertainty* concerning the *authenticity both of the Number*, and the *verse which contains the Number* χξς’; and *Dean Woodhouse*, by the *Mode of Calculation*, would be (what the *Sailors* would say,) *to let go the Sheet Anchor*, and thereby to incur certain Shipwreck.

What further doubt then can we have upon the subject of the NAME in Question? when the *Papists themselves* have literally *adopted the Epithet* ROMAN, both for their CHURCH and Empire, and have *Canonized the LATIN* as the MOTHER TONGUE of their ITALIAN, ROMAN, or LATIN CHURCH, whereby the POPE has *established the use of the ROMAN* and LATIN as his *self-approved MARKS of Distinction*? Wherefore let רומיית and Λατῆινος divide the spoil between them!!

Let us therefore proceed summarily to suggest the following *queries*:

I. Why is it that the *Kingdom of modern Rome* is designated by the *Papists*, at this very hour, ‘*Sanctum ROMANUM Imperium*,’ ‘*The Holy ROMAN Empire* ;’ if the *Sovereign Pontifical EMPIRE* be not AT ROME ?

II. Why is the *Church of Rome* denominated by the *Papists* themselves, ‘*Sacra ROMANA Ecclesia*,’ ‘*The Holy ROMAN Church* ;’ if *that Church* be not the ROMAN CHURCH to all intents and purposes ?

III. Why does the *Pope of Rome*, as a *professed Christian Bishop*, adopt the *Pagan Imperial Title* of “*PONTIFEX MAXIMUS*,” upon his TRIPLE CROWN or TIARA, if it be not with the intent of *identifying himself* with the *old Pagan HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF JUPITER*, which office and *Title* were *commonly held* by the *Roman Emperors* ?

IV. Why has the *Latin Vulgate Translation* of the *Holy Scriptures* been substituted and *canonized* by the Papal ‘*COUNCIL OF TRENT*,’ *instead of the HEBREW and GREEK Originals* ; if it be not intended by the said *Papal Council*, that the *Church of Rome* should, after the most mature *Deliberations*, be considered as a LATIN CHURCH ?

V. Why is it that the *Pope of Rome*, as the *professed VICAR and HEAD of Christ’s Church upon Earth*, RENOUNCES both his BAPTISMAL and SURNAME, and *assumes* (upon *ascending the Pontifical Throne*) some *fictitious Title of Eminence*, such as

LEO the Xth. SEXTUS the Vth. INNOCENT the XIIIth. CLEMENT the VIIIth. PIUS the VIIth. &c. if the *character of the POPEDOM* be not DIFFERENT from ALL OTHER Kingdoms upon Earth, and if it be not in direct imitation of the LATIN Imperial Titles on the one hand, and of the LATIN, ‘*Pontifex Maximus,*’ on the other?

It follows surely, as a matter of course, that, as the adopted *Appellative Name* of the *Italian Sovereign Pontifical Empire* is ROMAN, ‘*Sanctum ROMANUM Imperium;*’ and the *adopted Appellative Name* of the ITALIAN CHURCH is ROMAN, ‘*Sacra ROMANA Ecclesia;*’ and that the *canonized Language* of the *Italian Church*; her *Masses, Prayers, Hymns, Litanies, Canons, Decretals, Bulls, Councils, Edicts, Holy Scriptures*, are all in LATIN; and the *self-appropriated Title* of her HIGH PRIEST is LATIN, (viz. ‘*PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,*’) so the *Pope* as the *visible and acknowledged HEAD* (by *all the monarchs of Europe*) of the ‘*Holy Roman Empire,*’ and *Holy Roman or Latin Church*—(for ROMAN and LATIN are *herein used as Papal synonyms*, the *former* being used to denote the *Kingdom* of the *Pope*, the *latter* exhibiting the *Language or Speech* of *his Church*,) is a ROMAN and LATIN HEAD, and consequently, that his *Appellative imprinted NAME* must correspond with the *Proper Name* of his *Kingdom*, and the *Living Language* of his *Church*; with his *Pagan Latin Title* affixed to his TRIPLE CROWN, as the *Mysterious “MARK”* of his *Sovereignty*, all of which may be comprehended in these

two following Appellatives, both of which contain the sacred Number 666.

רומיית and Λατῆινος.

רומיית, ROMIITH, ROMANA, and Λατῆινος, LATEINOS,
LATEINUS.

It is a most remarkable circumstance, which may here be noticed that there *is not a single example* to be found in the entire of the *Old Testament Scriptures* (except in the corrupt period of the Maccabees), relative to the *Jewish Dispensation* of a *conjunction* of the HIGH PRIESTHOOD with the KINGLY GOVERNMENT, *similar* to that of the SOVEREIGN PONTIFF of ROME : for in the *Primitive Ages* of the CHURCH of GOD, (under the *Law*,) JEHOVAH himself was the KING of ISRAEL, MOSES was the deputed *Law-giver*, and AARON was the *High Priest*. In later times, SAUL was the *King of Israel*, and SAMUEL the *anointed Prophet* ; afterwards DAVID was the *King*, and ABIATHAR the *High Priest* ; and in the *time* of CHRIST, HEROD was the *King*, and CAIAPHAS was the *High Priest* : and then, ¹“ CHRIST the END of the LAW ” . . . ²“ The *Law* and the *Prophets* were until JOHN ” the *Baptist*. So that *through the whole* of the *Mosaic dispensation*, and the *Aaronic* or *Levitical High Priesthood*, we read not of any *one man* among the *Jews* who was legally anointed to be *King and High Priest* at the same moment. Moreover, *Christ* has not made mention of the

¹ Rom. x. 4.

² Luke xvi. 16.

continuance of the High Priesthood under the Gospel Dispensation, but the very contrary; which we infer from his reproof of his Disciples, who disputed respecting *supremacy*. ¹“And he came to *Caper-naum*; and being in the house, he asked them, What was it that ye *disputed* among yourselves by the way? But they *held their peace*; for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should be the GREATEST*. And he sat down, and called the TWELVE, and saith unto THEM, IF ANY MAN desire to be FIRST, THE SAME shall be LAST of ALL and SERVANT of ALL.” Now we know that ST. PETER was ONE of the TWELVE, and, from the words of Christ it is evident, that, as the office of the *High Priesthood* merged in the *spiritual and eternal Priesthood* of MESSIAS; so there is equal reason to believe that it was totally inconsistent with the *spiritual doctrine of Christ* to establish an EARTHLY KINGDOM, according to his own declaration to PILATE, ²“MY KINGDOM is *not of this world*;” and his conduct was in accordance with this declaration, for although he was “*Born KING of the JEWS*,” yet ³“when Jesus perceived that they would come and *take him by force*, to “*make him a KING*, he departed again into a mountain himself alone:” nevertheless, the POPE, as the *pretended VICAR of Jesus Christ*, is the *literal KING* of the *Territories of ROME*, and the ‘PONTIFEX MAXIMUS’ of the *whole world*. But by what means did the *Pope of*

¹ Mark ix. 33—35. Luke ix. 46; xxii. 24—26. Matt. xxiii. 11.

² John xviii. 36.

³ John vi. 15.

Rome become possessed of his *Earthly Kingdom*? Even by the *agency* and *instrumentality* of SATAN, “*the god of this world*,” as St. John informs us—¹ “And the DRAGON gave him HIS POWER, and HIS SEAT, and GREAT AUTHORITY.” But if it be objected that this *Power*, *Seat*, and *great Authority* was given to the ‘*First (Roman) Beast*,’ we prove that it was *likewise* given to the ‘*Second (Ecclesiastical Roman) Beast*,’ of whom it is written, that ² “HE *exerciseth* ALL THE POWER of the FIRST *Beast* ;” for ³ “HIS COMING is after the *working* of SATAN, with ALL POWER,” &c.: and it is an *historical Fact* that the SEAT of the SECOND *Beast* is the same as that of the FIRST, viz. ROME, and it is specially said of the *Second* or *Lamb-horned Beast* of the EARTH, that ⁴ “he SPAKE as a DRAGON ;” all of which corresponds with the *imperious character* of the *Sovereign Roman Pontiff*, as has been demonstrated in a variety of particulars throughout this work, in reference to his *dragon-like* persecutions of the Saints. And what can establish the *character of the Pope* as ANTICHRIST so strongly as his *real Assumption* of the TRIPLE CROWN with the EPISCOPAL MITRE? in doing which he has manifested to *all the Earth*, that the *origin of his Kingdom* is ⁵ “of the EARTH EARTHLY,” (as St. John predicted concerning it, ⁶ “And I beheld another *Beast* coming up out of the EARTH,”) and *not Christian*: moreover, his impudent *Transition*

¹ Rev. xiii. 2.² Rev. xiii. 12.³ 2 Thess. ii. 9.⁴ Rev. xiii. 11.⁵ John iii. 31.⁶ Rev. xiii. 11.

from the *lowest Christian Title* of ‘*Servus Servorum Dei*—*Servant of the Servants of God*,’ to those of the *highest grade*, as, first, ‘*Vicarius Salvatoris nostri Jesus Christi in Terra*,’ then, the *Pagan Title* of ‘*PONTIFEX OPTIMUS MAXIMUS*,’ then, *Universal Bishop*, or *Bishop of the World*, ‘*EPISCOPUS ORBIS*,’ and ‘*Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Pater ac Dominus*,’ then a *Deputy-God* upon EARTH, as PAUL the Vth. styled himself, ‘*VICE-DEO super TERRAM*,’ then, ‘*Father of Princes and Kings*, RULER OF THE WORLD’ (that is, the ‘*Holy Roman Empire*,’) *Pater Principum et Regum*, *RECTOR ORBIS*,’ and not satisfied with all these *Titles of superlative distinction*, he must have an *Attribute peculiar to God*; *Most Holy Father*; ‘*Sanctissime Pater*,’ all which arrogance manifests that HE is the “MAN of Sin,” the “SON of Perdition”, who “sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that HE is GOD,” “even Him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all Power, and signs and lying wonders;” and who is so infatuated with his IDOLATRY that he “*forgetteth what manner of MAN he is*,” but HE is verily a LATIN, as appears by his adopted LATIN *Language*, as HE is also a ROMAN by *Election*. Yea, so great a veneration hath this *compound ROMAN and LATIN MAN* for the *Holy Scriptures*, that, (by the edict of his *Council of Trent*, &c.) he has locked them up in the *Latin Tongue* of old *Pagan Rome*, and deposited them, together with the ‘*Power of the Keys*’ of St. Peter, in the Ark of the Roman and

Latin Covenant, between himself and his Latin Cardinals. What an uncommon respect, this MAN, this PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, has for the *Memory of* LATINUS the *ancient Founder of* LATIUM and the LATIN KINGDOM ; so much so, that he has made *choice of* that *particular* COUNTRY for his POPEDOM, and the *Language for his* CHURCH. And there can be no better proof of his *reverence for* ANTIQUITY, than his *predilection of* the LATIN *Vulgate*, ABOVE the HEBREW and GREEK *Originals*, or, the *vernacular tongue of* ITALY, which is ITALIAN.

There is another most remarkable fact illustrative of the conduct and character of the ROMAN or LATIN *Pontifex Maximus*, and that is, that the *Popes* at their *election and coronation*, not only assume to themselves *particular* TITLES of *distinction*, such as have been referred to already ; or such as are customary, as LEO Xth. INNOCENT XIIIth. but that they *relinquish entirely* their *own Proper Names*, both BAPTISMAL and SURNAME : so that *nothing* of their *Baptismal or Family Names* remains to them : for example, a *Cardinal* whose *Name* before time was called *Hippolitus Aldobrandinus* is created *Pope* by the *fictitious title* of CLEMENT the VIIIth. So that to be *created a Pope*, his *Baptismal and Surname* must BOTH *be renounced*. This is a pretty example of the *Baptismal Covenant*, in the *pretended* HEAD of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH,—the MAN who calls himself the *Vicar of Jesus Christ upon Earth*, and the *veritable* SUCCESSOR of *St. Peter*. It is well known that all the *Emperors, Kings and Princes*

who have been, or are *Members of the Latin Church of Rome* have universally retained their *Baptismal Names*; but the POPES, who have *exalted themselves ABOVE the Imperial Dignity*, must be *different from all Mankind in this Particular*? Did the *Jewish High Priests*, under the Law, change their *own Proper Names* from AARON to CLEMENT 1st.; from ABIATHAR to INNOCENT IInd., or from CAIAPHAS to LEO the IIIrd., or did the *Apostle PETER* originate this ANONYMOUS Custom for the POPES of ROME? Alas! how can we account for *such Magic, such Mystery, such Sophistry, such Jesuitry, such Art, such Deception* in the pretended VICAR of JESUS CHRIST? What *Apostolic precept*, what *Scriptural example* can be shown, why the CHIEF APOSTLE of CHRIST should become a NAMELESS, an ANONYMOUS MAN? Surely there is hardly any thing which the Pope says or does, but it is entirely *contrary to all Scripture precedent*, and connected with the *deepest MYSTERY*, which indeed is an *Appellative* that is allotted to, and well bestowed by St. Paul and St. John on this *Mystic Character*, viz: “*The MYSTERY of INIQUITY* ;” “*MYSTERY BABYLON*,” &c. ; “*MYSTERY of the WOMAN*.” Wherefore, to style *Hippolitus Aldobrandinus* by the Title of CLEMENT the VIIIth., is all the same as if he had been created Pope by the *highly significant Title* of HOCUS-POCUS the VIIIth. ; but of course the Pope, (and his *Infalible Counsellors*,) cannot ERR in such a *trivial matter* as that of *renouncing his Baptismal Name*!

To prevent all possible palliations which might

be ground^d by *Papists* on the *substitution* of the *Name of Simon* for that of *Peter*, and of *Saul* for that of *Paul*, as a scriptural sanction for the *Popes* doing the *same thing*, it may be observed, upon the clearest Testimony of *Holy Inspiration* that the Names of *SIMON* and *SAUL* were not relinquished, *ESPECIALLY* that of *SIMON*, (the *Pope's* pretended Predecessor,) and that neither *Peter* nor *Paul* ever assumed *feigned Names* or *Titles*, which are only befitting *Impostors*. *St. PETER* thus commences his *Second Epistle*. ¹ “*SIMON PETER, a Servant, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ,*” and it is certain that *PETER* had reached the *climax of his Apostleship* when he *wrote this Epistle*, for he alludes to his expectation of *Death* in a short time, in these words : ² “*Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance :*” And *St. Paul* was called to the work of the Ministry under the *Name* of *SAUL*, by the immediate *Agency of the Holy Spirit*, and was “*filled with the Holy Ghost,*” when he wrought the *Miracle of blindness* on *Elymas*, the *Sorcerer*, as we thus read. ³ “*The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and SAUL for the work whereunto I have called them.*” “*So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia,*” &c. Then *SAUL*, (who also is called *PAUL*,) *filled with the Holy Ghost*, set his eyes on him, (*viz. Elymas*,)

¹ 2 Peter i. 1.² Ibid. xiv. 15.³ Acts xiii. 2—4, 9—11.

“And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be *blind*, not seeing the sun for a season.” As the *Holy Spirit* has attested these things concerning PETER and PAUL so the *Popes* have not imitated the Apostles but *Osporco*, (the interpretation of which Name is, *Pigmouth*) who, on account of his *low origin*, changed his name to *Sergius*. It is *well worthy of observation*, that, although the *Popes* make so much ado about the NAME of PETER, and that almost every Pope assumes some new Title, not ONE of them has ever assumed the NAME of SIMON or PETER, as may be seen in the *Chronological Table* of the *Succession of Popes* set forth by ¹ PETAVIUS the *Jesuit*: although the Names of *Paul* and *John* are not unfrequent.

However, the *Proper* and *Appellative Name* *Λατῆινος* is virtually written upon the *Papal Kingdom*, which will very shortly be taken from this LATIN and ROMAN *Usurper* and *Autocrat*, because the “*Thousand Two Hundred and Threescore Days*” of *Years* have expired, and because the *Ten Kings* or *Kingdoms* of the LATIN or ROMAN EARTH, who, for the Time allotted by God, had “ONE MIND,” and gave their power and strength unto this *Beast*, are to take it away as soon as “the words of God shall be

¹ Petavii Rat. Temp. Tom. II. p. 129, usque 152. Edit. Parisiis. 1703.

fulfilled," as we read. ¹ "The TEN HORNS which thou sawest are TEN KINGS, which have received NO KINGDOM AS YET; but RECEIVE POWER as Kings one Hour with the Beast. THESE have ONE MIND, and shall GIVE THEIR POWER and STRENGTH unto the BEAST" . . . ² "And the TEN HORNS which thou sawest upon the Beast, THESE shall HATE *the* WHORE, and shall make Her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For GOD *hath put in their hearts* TO FULFIL HIS WILL, and to AGREE, and GIVE THEIR KINGDOM unto the BEAST, UNTIL the WORDS OF GOD shall be FULFILLED." Furthermore, If *God spared not* the NATURAL BRANCHES of his *ancient Church*, the JEWS! nor the MAGNIFICENT TEMPLE of JERUSALEM; (which was called "*The Joy of the whole Earth*," which was the *Seat of the Holy Prophets of God*, and of the *Inspired Apostles of Jesus Christ*: was the *very Temple to which Christ came*, and where he wrought many of his mighty works, and preached the Gospel, the CITY and TEMPLE over which he wept; and where he suffered Death upon the Cross;) much less will he spare thee, O ROME, or have respect to thy MAGNIFICENT BASILIQUE; or thy *Roman*, thy *Latin*, thy *Babylonish Pontiff*.

We further notice that as there is *no parallel in Holy Writ* between the *High Priesthood of Aaron* and that of the *Papal Roman*, "*Pontifex Maximus*," with regard to the *conjunction of the Monarchy with the High Priesthood*; so neither is there any

¹ Rev. xvii. 12, 13.

² Ibid 16.

parallel between retaining the Proper Names of the Jewish High Priests, and renouncing the Papal Proper Names for fictitious Titles of ANONYMOUS signification. And here perhaps, I may without any improper digression remark that there is no parallel in the *conduct and decretals* of the *Papacy* with reference to the *Institution of Marriage*; for among the JEWS, the HIGH PRIEST was *always permitted to marry*. St. PETER, the *Pope's* boasted predecessor, was a *married man*, for, as we read in the Gospels,¹ “Jesus entered into the House of *Peter's wife's* mother, who lay sick of a fever.” St. Peter, therefore, was evidently *no Pope*. Moreover, St. Paul tells us that ²“*marriage is honorable in ALL,*” &c. And again: “that, ³“If a man desire *the office of a Bishop*, he desireth a good work. A *Bishop*, therefore, must be blameless, the HUSBAND of *one wife*.” Of *Deacons* he observes, ⁴“Let the *Deacons* be the HUSBANDS of *one wife*,” and had St. Peter ‘*forbidden Marriage*’ to the Disciples, and commanded believers in Christ to *abstain from Meats*, he would have “Departed from the Faith,” for ⁵“THE SPIRIT SPEAKETH EXPRESSLY, that in the *latter Times* SOME shall *depart from the Faith*, giving heed to seducing spirits and Doctrines of Devils: *speaking lies in hypocrisy*; having their conscience seared with a hot Iron: *Forbidding to MARRY*, and *commanding to abstain from MEATS*, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them

¹ Matt. viii. 14. Mark i. 30. Luke iv. 38.

² Heb. xiii. 4.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 2.

⁴ Ibid. 12.

⁵ 1 Tim. iv. 1—3.

which believe and know the Truth." And did not our Lord himself with an Emphasis, that appears to be almost prophetic of the LATIN heresy, declare "MEATS defile not the Body?" Nor can any thing be clearer than that "*the Spirit speaks expressly,*" by the instrumentality of St. Paul, that "SOME should depart from the Faith," and that the Evidence of such Departure from the Faith would be signalized by "*Forbidding to MARRY, and commanding to abstain from MEATS:*" for which Two Interdicts the LATIN CHURCH of ROME is notorious in the Page of Ecclesiastical History, and, therefore, we conclude, that, as there is Apostolic Authority for "*Bishops*" and "*Deacons*" to Marry: and that all Believers in Christ who know the Truth are permitted to Eat MEATS at their own option: ¹ "for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and Prayer:" so also it is manifest that the Latin Church of Rome is denounced by St. Paul, in the express words of the Holy Spirit, as being "*seared with a hot iron*" for Her "*departure from the Faith,*" in the latter Times" of which departure she is proved guilty by such a Prohibition. As, then, we have the express authority of Christ and his Apostles for MARRIAGE in ALL, and the unrestricted use of MEATS, so have we the Holy Spirit's express CONDEMNATION of THOSE who forbid the same: such are the POPE and his COUNCILS. How can the Church of Rome clear

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 3—5.

Herself from this *charge of APOSTACY*? Who will have the impudence and inconsistency to contradict the *Fact*? Perhaps a MAN who has *publicly* and *officially renounced his own Baptismal and Family Name* to take a *Hocus-pocus Title* (such as LEO X. GREGORY XVI.) for no better Reason than to become the *Pope of Rome*, may have such effrontery; for HE who has *forbidden Marriage to the whole Body of his Clergy*, and *commanded Believers in Christ to abstain from Meats on every Friday and Saturday throughout the year*, (besides *Lent* and *numerous other Fast-days*,) contrary to the EXPRESS WORDS of the HOLY SPIRIT, would, in the words of St. Paul, “*speak Lies in Hypocrisy* ;” by endeavouring to establish a belief, that HE has the *most unlimited and independent Power* to act so without the Sanction of the Holy Scriptures, or any Apostolical Voucher or Precedent. It is particularly mentioned by St. Paul that this species of Departure from the Christian Faith, (i. e. Forbidding to Marry, and commanding to abstain from Meats,) would be associated with “*speaking lies in hypocrisy*” and “*lying wonders*” which have been verified to the Letter; for when the Pope calls himself the ‘*Vicar of Jesus Christ upon Earth*,’ and ‘*Servant of the Servants of God*,’ we know that it is *Hypocrisy*, and that *He* is a *Liar*; because his TRIPLE CROWN sheweth that He pretends to be *King of all Earthly Kings*, and the *Lord of all Earthly Lords*, and his followers call him *Our Lord God the Pope*: and because his *general speech* is that of the DRAGON, as the *Holy*

Spirit declares, ¹ “ *He spake as a Dragon,*” even though he wears the “ *two Horns like a Lamb,*” the external semblance of an Ecclesiastical Dignitary.

Furthermore, because the *Pope* calls the *most horrible, devilish, and bloody INQUISITION* by the *Title* of the “ *HOLY INQUISITION,*” we know from the Holy Scriptures that it is nothing but a “ *Lying Wonder,*” such as no MAN, who is not *himself*, the “ *Son of Perdition,*” would either venture to utter or believe, and, therefore, when the *Pope* is called “ *His Holiness,*” and “ *Most Holy Father,*” and *his Church* “ *The Holy Roman Church,*” and the States of his Church, “ *The Holy Roman Empire,*” and when the common Titles which the *most furious Popes* have assumed are those of PIUS, CLEMENT, INNOCENT, &c. we fearlessly declare that it is nothing else than “ *speaking Lies in Hypocrisy;*” for the *Lives of the Popes* in general, as set forth by PLATINI, BOWER, and *others*, are too well known to suffer us to suppose that *Popery* is any thing *less* than the “ *MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.*” We prove likewise from *Holy Scripture* that the *Papal* ‘ PONTIFEX MAXIMUS,’ *cannot be the Vicar of Jesus Christ,* because *he hath* an EARTHLY KINGDOM, and *Christ* said most explicitly to *his Disciples*, “ *My kingdom is not of this world.*”

Such a *Temporal and Spiritual Kingdom* as the *Popedom*, such an *Imperium in Imperio*, is in open hostility to the public Peace and Happiness of

¹ Rev. xiii. 11.

Europe ; even as ¹ *King Louis the XII.* (surnamed, *Le Père du Peuple*,) had formerly evinced to *Pope Julius II.* who, when he was thundered at by this Pope, overthrew Him and his Adherents in a *Battle* at *Ravenna* ; and at *Pisa* assembled a *Council* against the Pope, causing CERTAIN CROWNS OF GOLD to be stamped with this superscription, “ PERDAM NOMEN BABYLONIS,” “ I WILL DESTROY THE NAME OF BABYLON :” thereby testifying to the whole world his firm *belief*, that, *Rome Papal* is the ² MYSTIC BABYLON of the *Revelations*. Here then is *King Louis XIIth*, ONE of the ³ “ TEN HORNS ” or KINGS of the *Papal Roman Earth*, purposing to *destroy the Name of Babylon* ; first, by a defeat of the Pope and his Adherents in *Battle* ; then, by calling a *Council* of the Nation to witness his Royal intentions *against the Pope* and *Popery* ; and, then, finishing the whole matter by causing the impress of his intentions to be put on the *Gold Coin of the Realm* : and *Buonaparte* was evidently possessed with the *same belief*, when he *compelled Pope Pius VI.* to *sign the Renunciation of His TEMPORAL POWER*, which he did, beginning with these words :

¹ “ In sequito degli ordini superiori si denuncia a tutte le persone dello stato Ecclesiastico di qualunque grado, e condizione, &c.

“ G. Della Porta, Tesoriere Generale.”

¹ See Peter Du Moulin's *Buckler of the Faith*. Second Edition, p. 543.

² Rev. xvii. 5.

³ Ibid. 12.

⁴ See Duppa's *Journal*. Sec. iv. p. 35, 36. London, 1799.

“Yielding to the orders of our Superiors, we *denounce all Persons* of the ECCLESIASTICAL STATE, of *whatever RANK or CONDITION, &c. &c.*

“G. Della Porta, Treasurer General.”

And when this Deed of Renunciation and Denunciation was signed, it was said that the Pope *under-signed* these words, “Noi cediamo l'autorità nostra agl'ordini superiori. Pio Sesto.” We cede our Authority to force.—*Pius the Sixth.*”

Buonaparte then expelled *Pius Sextus* from *Rome*, and sent him to *Tuscany, Sienna, and Florence*, and *ransacked the Vatican, with every other Palace, and Church in Rome, &c.*; and, on another occasion the *Emperor* brought *Pope Pius the VII.* a state Prisoner to *Fontainbleau*, and asked him how he reconciled his TEMPORAL KINGDOM with the words of *Christ*, ¹“*Mon Règne n'est pas de ce Monde,*” “*My kingdom is not of this world.*” But there is only one Answer to this inquiry, which may be summed up in the words of *Christ* to his Servant *St. Peter*, whose *Successors* the *Popes* pretend to be, in reference to the *Ecclesiastical Office* and *Dignity.*

²“*All they that take the Sword shall perish with the Sword:*”

But the *Popes* of *Rome* “*take the Sword;*”

Therefore the *Popes* of *Rome* “*shall perish with the Sword.*”

Richard Duppa's Journal of the most remarkable

¹ John xviii. 36.

² Matt. xxvi. 52. John xviii. 10, 11. compared with Rev. xiii. 10.

occurrences that took place in *Rome*, upon the *subversion of the Ecclesiastical Government*, in 1798, (second edition) will throw much light on this subject. The more than absurd infatuation of Pope *Pius VI.* is ridiculous in the extreme; for to prevent the downfall of his Earthly Kingdom, he issued an *Edict* for a *Procession* of the *most sacred Relics*, which were carried in a solemn manner through the streets of *Rome*. *Mr. Duppa* writes as follows—¹ ‘As the *interposition* of *miracles* in the *Catholic world* has always been a very powerful agent to promote the interest of the Church, so upon *this occasion*, they were not wanting to oppose the impending danger that so imminently threatened the destruction of *her Temporal Power*.’

‘*The Pictures of the Virgin Mary had opened their eyes in different Parts of the Town*, which, by favourable exposition, was supposed to be a *manifestation of her peculiar grace and favour to the Roman People*. This miracle, however futile or false it may seem to men of reflection, had so powerful an influence over the minds of the multitude, as to produce an enthusiasm little short of madness. The *constant processions, night and day, illuminations, Ave-Marias, and Litanies*, were attended with so much clamour and tumult, that it was thought prudent for the Missionaries to recommend to the people to abate their fervour, as *the Government* became fearful lest it might pass the limits of restraint, and riot succeed to the vehemence of devotion.’

¹ Duppa's Journal, sect. ii. p. 13—16.

‘ It was now, however, when *no Embassy from foreign Courts brought hope of assistance*, and THE STATE felt the near approach of its inevitable fall, that, as A LAST RESOURCE, *His Holiness* issued an *Edict* for a *solemn Procession* to be made of THREE of the *most sacred Relics of the Christian Church*. The first was a *Portrait of Jesus Christ*, called *il Santo Volto*, supposed to have been painted by *supernatural agency*. This picture was never shown to the people, or carried in procession, but at times of the greatest national calamity and distress. In the year 1709, it was exhibited, to avert the consequences of a dreadful earthquake ; since which, till now, it had never been exposed to the public. The second was a *celebrated Portrait of the Virgin Mary*, of *Santa Maria in Portico*. And the third was the *chains with which St. Peter was fettered when in Prison*, and from which the angel freed him when he was set at liberty.’

As the “ 1260 *Days* ” of years were *fulfilled* about the year 1793, so the *Dark Ages* of Papal Superstition were *ended*, and, therefore, the exhibition of Pictures and the chains of St. Peter, with an intent to *avert the Judgments of God against the Roman Church* were of no avail, *the Hour being then come* to expose to public odium and execration, the wickedness of confiding in such “ *superstitious vanities*,” such “ *refuges of lies*,” such “ *Satanic devices*,” on the part of the *Pretended Vicar of Jesus*, whose *Edict* was more characteristic of the *High Priest of Jupiter*, than the Head of the Church. “ Let no

man deceive you by any means" that the Pope is, *ex officio*, "*Antichrist*," the "*Man of Sin*," the "*Son of Perdition*," not only to "*be revealed in his Time*," but likewise "*destroyed*," whom St. Paul tells us, ¹ "The Lord shall *consume* with the *spirit of his Mouth*, and shall *destroy* with the *brightness of his coming*:" and, that, as the word of God is true concerning the *Time* of the *second Beast's continuance*, (i. e. 1260 years,) so *Napoleon Bonaparte* finished, in the *Reign* and *Person* of *Pope Pius VI.* what *King Louis* the XII. had begun, by *obliging the Pope to sign the Renunciation of his Temporal Power*, and *leave Rome and its Treasures* forthwith: and although a *shadow* of the *Papal Sovereignty* still exists, it is *only a shadow*, and those who look for *any other Name than LATEINOS* for a solution of the *Mystical Number* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, will be as much disappointed as *Pope Pius* the VIth, his *Cardinals*, and the *deluded People of Rome* were, when they found that the *sacred Pictures* and the *Prison chains of St. Peter* were of *none effect* to save his *Holiness* or his *kingdom* from that *long predicted vengeance* against the *Kingdom of Antichrist*, of which the *Pope* is the *Supreme Head*; even ² the "*MAN*," who "*had two horns like a Lamb*, and *HE SPAKE AS A DRAGON*."

As the *Rise of the Papal Power* may be dated from the ³ *Edict of the Emperor Justinian*, in favour of *Pope John*, A. D. 533, so we may date the *commence-*

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 8.

² Rev. xiii. 11, 18.

³ See the *Edict of Justinian*, quoted by Cuninghame on the *Apocalypse*, p. 202, &c. Second edit, 1817.

ment of the 1260 Days of Years from that time, which would consequently *end* with A. D. 1793; and it is a fatal coincidence, that in the Reign of Pope *Pius Sextus*, A. D. 1798, the *Papal Ecclesiastical Government* was *completely overthrown*, and this Pope compelled to *sign the Resignation of his Temporal Power*, and go into banishment. Here then is *History* illustrating and confirming the *fact* that the 1260 Days of Years *foretold by St. John*, had fully *ended*, A. D. 1798, and what is still more remarkable, that the *Papists themselves* had an existing persuasion, *before the event happened*, that the *Roman Ecclesiastical State* would be *destroyed* in the *Reign of a SEXTUS*, as may be inferred from their own *voluntary Satire on this Title*, which was assumed by *Cardinal Braschi*, at the time of his election to the *Pope-dom*, and as set forth in a *Note* in the *Journal* of Mr. Duppa. ¹ ‘The Romans (says Mr. Duppa) have a credulous prejudice amongst them, that THE STATE must ever be ruined when governed by a SEXTUS; and when *Cardinal Braschi* was elevated to the *Pontifical Honours* by the *Title* of *PIUS the SIXTH*, the day after his election, this elegant and severe satire was to be read on the corners of the streets, and in every public Piazza in Rome—

‘*Tarquinius Sextus, Sextus Nero, Sextus et Iste;*

‘*In Sextis semper perdita Roma fuit.*’

The power which the *Emperor Justinian* gave to *Pope John*, A. D. 533, *Napoleon Bonaparte* took

¹ Duppa’s *Journal*, sect. i. p. 1.

away from *Pope* SEXTUS, A. D. 1798, agreeable to the Prophecy of St. John, ¹ “*God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their Kingdom unto the Beast, UNTIL the words of God shall be FULFILLED.*” The “1260 Days” of Prophetical years having expired A. D. 1793, we conclude that the “*words of God are fulfilled,*” and this fact is confirmed by the *Pope* being compelled to put his *Pontifical Roman Signature* to his *Downfall*,—‘PIO SESTO,’ to which we may add the χάραγμα of his *Kingdom*, which is, LATEINOS.

¹ Rev. xvii. 17.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE SUBJECT RECAPITULATED, WITH A BRIEF NOTICE
OF THE VARIOUS LATIN TITLES ASSUMED BY THE
PAPACY.

HAVING already shown that LATINUS (in Greek Λατῆινος) is the NAME *of a MAN*, and that the ancient *Orthography* of IRENÆUS in his *two-fold* use of the *Diphthong* or *Broad* $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\iota$, was esteemed perfectly classical in his time; also that the said *Proper Name* contains the true “*Number of a Man*,” which is $\chi\acute{\xi}\varsigma'$, 666: and having also reminded my readers that the *universal* and *canonized Language* of the *Church of Rome* (in lieu of the *Italian*, or *Greek*,) is LATIN, which constitutes the *Pope a LATIN HEAD*; that the Pope who is the *HEAD of the CHURCH of ROME* is both the *SOVEREIGN of ROME* and “*PONTIFEX MAXIMUS*,” wearing the *TRIPLE TIARA* or *CROWN* as the *Emblem* of the *former*, and the *EPISCOPAL MITRE* of the *latter*;

and, that, by exercise of this *two-fold Sovereignty*, the *Pope* is a *Roman Sovereign* and *Latin High Priest*: that the *SEAT* of the *Papal Latin Empire* is *ROME*, which was the *ancient Capital* of the *Roman Emperors*, (whose *Language* was *Latin*,) and to whose *CITY* and *KINGDOM* the *Popes* have gradually succeeded by craft and usurpation after the breaking up of the old *Roman Empire*, and the change of the *Seat of Government* from *Rome* to *Constantinople*; that the *Pope* (in the character of the “*Man of Sin*,” “the *Son of Perdition*,”) “*sitteth in the Temple of God*,” and is worshipped by all the *People of Rome* as a *God*, according to the prophecy of *St. Paul* to the *Thessalonians*,¹ “*Let no man deceive you by any means; for that Day shall not come, EXCEPT there come a FALLING AWAY FIRST, and that MAN of Sin be Revealed, the SON of Perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that HE as GOD sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that HE is GOD;*” that the *Pope* has not only adopted the *LATIN Language* for the use of the *Church of Rome*; but has taken to Himself, as an appendage to his *TIARA*, (in *Letters of Diamonds*,) the *Pagan Cæsarean Latin Title* of “*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*,” as the *Pagan Roman Emperors* did, who sacrificed to *JUPITER*, whose *High Priests* they were: that the *Papal Latin Church of Rome* claims to be the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all *Churches in the world*: this is

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

obvious from the ‘*Roman Catechism*’ and ‘*Trent Confession of Faith*,’ in these words, ¹ “*Ecclesia Romana, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum, Mater est et Magistra,*” &c. that the *Church of Rome* “forbids *Marriage*” to her *Priesthood*, and “*Meats*” to her *Laity*, thereby fulfilling the express words of the *Holy Spirit* concerning *Apostacy*, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 3, and also ‘*speaks in an UNKNOWN TONGUE in the Church,*’ viz. *LATIN*, which latter *Heresy*, if it stood alone, proves her “*falling away*” or “*departure from the Faith*: that there is none other *City in the world*, seated on *SEVEN MOUNTAINS* or *HILLS* of *classical* or *historical* celebrity, but *ROME*; or, over which *Rome* does not claim *Ecclesiastical ascendancy*; and, therefore, the *Pope* is clearly seen to be the *Mystical Babylonish MAN*, or *Ecclesiastical Abomination*, which *St. John* saw in *Vision* as the great corrupter of *Christ’s Church*, seated upon the “*Seven Mountains*” which indicate the *locality* of *ROME*; for, as the *Euphratean Babylon* was destroyed before the *Christian Æra*; so there can be no doubt that *Rome* is intended by the figure,² “*MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT,*” “*that GREAT CITY, which reigneth over the KINGS OF THE EARTH.*” This opinion is pointedly confirmed to us by the words of ³ *King Louis the XIIth*, when he had overthrown *Pope JULIUS the IIInd*, and caused certain *CROWNS OF GOLD* to be stamped with this

¹ Bp. Jewell’s Apology, p. 33. Edit. Isaacson.

² Rev. xvii. 5 and 18.

³ See “*The Buckler of the Faith*,” by Peter Du Moulin, p. 543.

superscription, “ PERDAM NOMEN BABYLONIS.”
 ‘ I WILL DESTROY *the* NAME of BABYLON.’

How *sound*, therefore, and *conclusive* are the remarks of *Dr. Henry More* on this point! No one, indeed, who will give a moment’s attention to the subject, can fail of perceiving their force and pertinency. The *Doctor* remarks,¹ “ The *Woman* which thou sawest is that *Great City* which [NOW *Reigneth*] over the *Kings of the Earth*.” For it is in the PRESENT *Tense*, and spoken in *St. John’s time*, when there was no seven-hilled City that reigned over the *Kings of the Earth* but OLD ROME. And, therefore, of NECESSITY it is SHE.” To which remarks I would add the parallel opinion of *Irenæus* for his production of the *conjectured Name* LATINOS, wherein he calls the *Latin*, or *Roman Empire*, “ NOVISSIMUM REGNUM,” “ the *Last Kingdom* ;” and then gives his Reason, “ LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC REGNANT : ” “ For they are LATINS who NOW REIGN.” And, by the revival of the *Latin Language* by the *Papacy*, in the *City of Rome*, and throughout the *States of the Church of Rome*, we know that the *Sovereign Pontifical Empire* is, (as far as it regards the LATIN,) “ *Novissimum Regnum*,” “ *The Last Kingdom* ;” and that *Rome*, therefore, is “ MYSTERY, BABYLON the GREAT ;” “ that GREAT ” (*Ecclesiastical, Seven-Hilled*), “ CITY, which [NOW] reigneth over the *Kings of the Papal Roman Earth*.”

¹ Dr. H. More’s Works. Fol. p. 593. London, 1708.

Dr. *More* further remarks, ¹“ But why do I go about so industriously to prove that which our very Adversaries do not deny, as *Ribera* and *Cornelius à Lapide*, who both acknowledge *Old Rome* here meant, and *Alcazar* also and *Bellarmino* upon particular evincement from this verse? The words of *Bellarmino* are, “ *Neque enim alia Civitas est quæ Johannis tempore Imperium habuerit super Reges terræ quàm ROMA, et notissimum est supra septem Montes Romam ædificatam esse.*” Which two things joined together are a Demonstration that *Rome in Italy here is meant, and no other City.*” May we not say then, that the CITY of ROME (“ *Mystery, Babylon the Great* ”) is *all but named by St. John?* and that he could not have come nearer to the Name than by saying *it is Rome*; it is the *Latin, or Roman Pontifical City*: that “ *Great* ” Ecclesiastical “ *City* ” which Reigneth over the Kings and Kingdoms of the old Roman Earth, out of which she arose, and into which She succeeded by craft during the villainous Reign of the Usurper and Regicide Emperor² *Phocas* the IInd.

Thus have we discovered by the *aid of the Holy Scriptures*, the *conjectures of Irenæus, Tertullian*, and *others*, *subsequent History*, and *undeniable facts*, that the *Latin Mark, Latin Name, Latin Number, Latin Language, Latin Church, and Kingdom of Rome*, are fully descriptive of this

¹ Dr. H. More's Works, p. 593.

² See the Confirmative Edict of *Phocas*, quoted by *Cuninghame* on the Apocalypse, p. 207.

Mystical, Idolatrous, Papal Latin MAN, the proper Appellative of whom is LATEINOS : that the *Number* of his *Name* is 666 ; the *time* of his *Reigning* “ 1260 Days ” of *Years* ; the *situation* of his “ *Great City* ” upon the “ *Seven Mountains* ; ” all of which *concentre* in the *Roman* and *Latin Name* and *City* of *Rome*. To *doubt*, therefore, *any longer* upon this *subject* seems plainly *inexcusable*, for vain would be the attempt to discover *any other Proper* and *Appellative Name* of a *MAN*, which can be *thus applied* in *almost every possible manner* to the *PAPAL CHURCH, CITY, KINGDOM, LANGUAGE, TITLES, &c. &c.* wherefore *POPERY* is *fully characteristic* of the “ *MAN*,” who is the “ *Man of Sin*,” the “ *Son of Perdition*,” the “ *Mystery of Iniquity*,” the “ *Wicked One*,” whose *Mystical* “ *MARK*,” or “ *NAME*,” we are exhorted by *St. John* to seek after, by the means of “ *wisdom* ” and “ *understanding*,” and then to “ *count* the “ *Number* ” of his *NAME*. The “ *wisdom* ” then to which we presume we have arrived, is, that by the *union* of the *Papal Mitre* with the *Triple Crown* or *Tiara*, we have come to the “ *understanding* ” that “ *the Beast*,” who (according to the very words of *St. John*) “ *had two Horns* like a *LAMB*,” represents the *ecclesiastical character* and *dignity* of the *Pope*, whereof the *episcopal Mitre* is the emblem ; and as it is by him said of the *second Beast* that “ *HE exerciseth ALL the POWER of the FIRST BEAST*, and *spake as a DRAGON*,” we understand the *Dragon-like speech* to represent the *TEMPORAL POWER* of the *POPE*, (to

wit, the *Triple Crown*, which is the Emblem of Triple Sovereignty,) which *latter* has *never been exceeded* by the most *Tyrannical Pagan Emperors* of *ancient Rome*. Wherefore as *ROME PAGAN* was the *first Beast*, so is *ROME PAPAL* the *second Beast*, which St. John saw “*coming up out of the EARTH :*” and, consequently, as *Λατῆινος* is the *Name of a Man*, according to *Irenæus*, *Virgil*, &c. and contains the *true Number 666*, by the *individual Greek Letters* of the *Name*, and is in every possible sense applicable to the *Mystical Papal Kingdom*, so is it the *proper Appellative of the Pope of Rome*, whose *Kingdom, Reign, City, and Name* are all *Numbered*, and whose *indelible “ MARK ”* is *LATIN*.

As we have traced the *Pope* to head quarters, we may presume with tolerable confidence that *HE* is the “*MAN*” whose *Appellative* or *Descriptive Name* we intended to elicit from the *enigmatical Number* $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, or 666, and it may throw some additional light on the subject of the *mystic Name*, to mention a few of the *Sovereign Titles* and *Epithets* which the *Pope* assumes to himself, or which are bestowed upon him by his *Conclave of Cardinals*, at the time of his *Installation, Coronation*, &c. which are all of a *LATIN* complexion, and characterise his *duplex power*, fulfilling those words of St. John, ¹ “*He is the eighth, and is of the seven,*” i. e. ‘*Imperium in Imperio,*’ namely, ‘*Sanctum Romanum Imperium,*’ and ‘*Sacra Romana Ecclesia.*’

¹ Rev. xvii. 11.

I.

*The Sovereign Title
of
The Temporal Kingdom
of
Papal Rome.*

‘ SANCTUM ROMANUM IMPERIUM.’

Sovereign Titles

given to the *Popes*, (in lieu of their *Baptismal* and *Surnames*) at the time of their *Election* and *Coronation*; such as—

JULIUS LIGUR. II.	VICTOR IV.
GREGORIUS VII.	FELIX V.
SEXTUS V.	PIUS VII.
CLEMENS VIII.	INNOCENS XIII.
PAULUS V.	LEO X.
LUCIUS II.	ALEXANDER III.

Sovereign Pontifical Titles

assumed by the Popes; the first of which is *Pagan*, the others *Blasphemous*.

¹ ‘ PONTIFEX OPTIMUS MAXIMUS.’

² ‘ VICE-DEO SUPER TERRAM.’

³ ‘ PATER PRINCIPUM et REGUM : RECTOR ORBIS.

¹ The Title of Gregory XIII.

² Title of Paul V.

³ Coronation Title given to Pope Innocent XIII.

II.

*The Ecclesiastical Title
of
The Metropolitan Church
and
Spiritual Hierarchy
of
Papal Rome.*

‘ SACRA ROMANA ECCLESIA.’

‘ ECCLESIA ROMANA, quæ OMNIUM ECCLESIARUM,
MATER est et MAGISTRA.

*Ecclesiastical Titles
of
Supremacy, Universality, Blasphemy, and of mock
humility, used by and concerning the Popes.*

‘ EMINENTISSIMUS et REVERENDISSIMUS PATER ac
DOMINUS.’

‘ EPISCOPUS ORBIS.’

‘ VICARIUS SALVATORIS NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI IN
TERRA.’

‘ SANCTISSIMUS PATER.’

‘ SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.’

As all the foregoing LATIN *Titles*, with very many others, are assumed by or bestowed upon the *Popes of Rome*, may we not thence say they savour much more of their *Latin pagan predecessors* the *Roman*

Emperors, whose *seat* and *kingdom* they occupy, than of St. PETER the *Apostle of Christ*? For, I would ask, *What humble, poor and despised MAN*, like St. PETER, would think of *assuming to himself* such *monstrous* and *blasphemous Titles*, whereby to *glorify his Lord and Master Jesus Christ*, and of taking a *TIARA*, or *Triple Crown*, or *Royal Diadem*, in addition, *more magnificent* perhaps than *any of those* which were worn by the *Emperors and Kings* of the *Roman Earth*, up to the *time of Louis the XIIth*. [See a *splendid engraving* of the *Papal Tiara of Julius II.* with the *description* of it, as set forth in the *Voyages of the Sr. A. De La Motraye*, Tom. I. chap. ii. p. 30 and 32.] And then to make yet one more allusion to that most *unscriptural practice* of *inculcating Religion* in an “*unknown tongue*.” Is not *LATIN* the *Mother Tongue of the Papal Church of Rome at this very hour*, although it is a *Dead Language* in all *Europe and the World*, yea, even in all *ITALY* and at *ROME itself*? The *Papal* ¹“*Masses, Prayers, Hymns, Litanies, Canons, Decretals, Bulls, &c.* are expressed in *LATIN*. The *Papal Councils* speak in *Latin*. *Women* themselves *pray in Latin*. The *Holy Scripture* is not read in *any other Language* under *Popery*, than *Latin*. The *Council of Trent* has commanded the *Vulgar Latin* to be the *only authentic Version*. The *Roman Doctors* prefer it to the *Hebrew and Greek Text* itself, which was written by the *Prophets and Apostles*: and there-

¹ More's *Mystery of Iniquity*, Part II. Book i, chap. 15. sect. 8. London, 1706.

fore it is *conclusive* that as the *Papists Latinize in every thing*, so the *Proper and Appellative Name* LATEINOS is in every way applicable to *Popery*. The POPE therefore is the “MAN” who carries the *Mark or Name of the Beast*, or the *Number of his Name*, having the descriptive *Mark of both Beasts*, that is, *Sovereign and Pontifical*; inasmuch as he is a *Latin by Language, a Roman by Election: Exercises all the Power of the First Beast*, and is the *Image made to the first Beast*; for upon the *Creation of the Pope*, these words are said: ‘*Quem Creant, Adorant,*’ ‘*whom they create, they adore.*’ And if the *Speech of poor Peter bewrayed him* that he was a *Galilean*, although he endeavoured to conceal it; how much rather does the *openly professed LATIN Tongue of the POPE bewray HIM* that HE is the *Mystical Roman or LATIN MAN of the Secular and Pontifical Empire of modern Rome*. Look to it, therefore, O *Papist*, if, peradventure, thou canst recover thy Pope from the deadly wound which the faithful Martyr *Irenæus* hath inflicted on thy *LATIN HEAD*, wherewith *he hath* (by a Bow drawn at a Venture) *smitten thy CHURCH and KINGDOM; thy MITRE and TRIPLE CROWN; thy Latin Roman MAN*. Prepare then, O *Papist*, thy *Latin Coffin* (for the *doom of Popery is come*, the “1260 Days” of Years having *expired*,) and embalm the *Effigy of thy Majestic LATIN IDOL*, and let thy *Asbestos* be of *true Latin Texture*, that the Fire of Vesuvius scorch not his *LATIN HOLINESS*, for “the smoke of his Torment ascendeth up for ever and ever.”

O LATIN PAPA, the *Church of Christ* will mourn *thy exit*: but *only as the Jews* of old did that of *Herod the Great*, after they had *escaped* from the ¹ *Circus* or *Hippodrome* at *Jericho*, in which that Monster had caused them to be imprisoned, commanding that they should be destroyed *immediately after his Death*; and because of *those* whom THOU hast *shut up* in thy INFERNAL INQUISITION, hast *tortured, burned, and massacred* to the number of *three Millions*, and *others* whom thou hast *anathematized* and *turned out of thy LATIN ROMAN CHURCH*; (the *great Antichristian* “*SYNAGOGUE of SATAN*;”) because of *these*, and *all other*, thy horrible *Monstrosities*, and “*lying wonders* ;” KNOW that “*thy latter end shall be worse than the beginning* !”

As the *Pope of Rome* has chosen to be *styled*: ‘*The Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ upon Earth*,’ and yet as he *renounces* his *Baptismal* and *Family NAMES*, and *substitutes the vulgar LATIN*, for the *vernacular Tongue of Rome and Italy*, which is *ITALIAN*; so it is evident that HE is an ANONYMOUS MAN; wherefore, it is only *consistent* with the *word of God* that he should be branded with the characteristic *Mark* of “*the Man of Sin*,” “*the Son of Perdition*,” “*the Mystery of Iniquity*,” “*the Wicked one*,” “*the Antichrist*,” for these, and such like terms, may be fairly associated with his most wonderful *descriptive, proper, enigmatical* and *Appellative Name* Λατῆινος. Let him, therefore, *be allowed* in requital of his most *Myste-*

¹ Joseph. Antiqui. Lib. xvii. chap. vi.

rious Tyranny, the full enjoyment of his *Mock* and *Blasphemous Titles* which he has assumed, ¹ (“and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of NAMES of BLASPHEMY,”) that he may appear as Monstrous as he is described by *St. Paul* and *St. John*, and that his *Proper* and *Appellative Name* may be written in HEBREW, GREEK, and LATIN characters

(רומיית. ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ. LATEINUS.)

upon the *Pontifical LABARUM*, or *Mystical ROMAN STANDARD*, and placed in the VATICAN PALACE at ROME, as a STANDARD MEMORIAL of the *indubitable NAME* of the “MAN,” whose NUMBER is χξς', 666 : that all EUROPE may exclaim in mock derision :

“ECCE HOMO !!”

Ecce! ² “NOMEN *Bestiæ*, aut Numerum NOMINIS ejus. Numerus enim HOMINIS est, et NUMERUS EJUS SEXCENTA SEXAGINTA SEX.” And we may add the words of *Irenæus* to those of *St. John*, and say, “LATEINOS NOMEN habet Sexcentorum Sexaginta Sex Numerum: et Valde Verisimile est, quoniam novissimum Regnum hoc habet vocabulum. LATINI enim sunt qui NUNC REGNANT: i. e. in the Person and Character of the Pope of Rome, the Appellative of whose Ecclesiastical Kingdom is רומיית ROMAN; (“Sacra ROMANA Ecclesia;”) but the NAME of the MAN, (whose “NUMBER is Six Hundred Threescore and Six”) is Λατῆινος, LATEINUS.

ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ.

¹ Revelations xvii. 3.

² Revelations xiii. 17, 18.

ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ.

Λ	=	. 3 0
α	=	. . 1
τ	=	3 0 0
ε	=	. . 5
ι	=	. 1 0
ν	=	. 5 0
ο	=	. 7 0
ς	=	2 0 0
<hr/>		
		6 6 6
<hr/>		

With a little attention we may soon discover by the *pompous* and *most unexampled manner* which this LATIN . . “*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*” ascends the *Papal Throne*; by the *nature* of his *Papal Proclamation*; with the subsequent *secular* and *Ecclesiastical Titles* and *Fictitious Name* which he so *Innocently* and *modestly assumes*, that HE is the “MAN,” whose “MARK,” “NAME,” and “NUMBER” are referred to by *St. John*; and thus we are well assured, that the EVENT is the sure *Interpreter of the Prophecy*. It will only be necessary, therefore, to give an *Historical Account* of the *Election, Proclamation, and Coronation* of *Pope INNOCENT XIII*, who succeeded *CLEMENT XI*, (as recorded by *Edward Wright, Esq.*, who was an eye-witness of the Ceremonies,) as conclusive on this subject.

CHAPTER XX.

AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE ELECTION, PROCLAMATION, AND CORONATION OF POPE INNOCENT XIII. (AS RECORDED BY EDWARD WRIGHT, ESQ.) ILLUSTRATING THE GENIUS OF POPERY.

“ROME.”

¹“We made the more haste,” says Mr. *Wright*, from *Naples* to *Rome* in expectation of seeing the *Ceremonies* of the *Holy Week*; but the principal were omitted, by reason of the Death of the Pope (CLEMENT XI.) which had happened a little before.”

²“*Clement* XI. died the 19th of *March*, 1721, N. S. after a Reign of twenty years, and about three Months. He was esteemed a Man of learning, and affable Behaviour, and gave patient Audience to the meanest: However, his Subjects thought he had reigned long enough. The ROMANS please themselves with the Jubilee of a new Promotion; the Court Favours are then to run in a new channel, and every Man is in hopes of some Benefit by the change.”

¹ Wright's Travels in Italy, &c. vol. i. p. 189. London, 1730. ² Ibid. 190.

“The conclave for the Election of the new Pope sate about five weeks, which is reckoned but a short time. It was shut up the 30th of *March*, and the new Pope was proclaimed the 8th of *May* by Cardinal *Panfilio*, who came to the *Loggia della Beneditione*, over the noble Portico which is at the entrance into *St. Peter's Church*; there with a Thundering Voice he spake as follows:”

“*Annuncio vobis Gaudium magnum; PAPAM habemus; EMINENTISSIMUM et REVERENDISSIMUM PATREM ac DOMINUM Mich. Angelum, Titulo S. S. Quirici et Julitæ SACRÆ ROMANÆ ECCLESIAE Presbyterum, Cardinalem de Comitibus, qui NOMEN sibi Assumpsit INNOCENTIVM XIII.*”

“*I bring you Tidings of great Joy*; we have a Pope; the Most Reverend Father and Lord *Michael Angelo, Priest of the Holy ROMAN Church, Cardinal de Conti*, with the *Title*¹ of *S. Quiricus and Julita*; who has taken upon him the *Name of INNOCENT XIII.*”

“This sort of *Annunciation* to the People seems to have a plain Allusion to that of the Angel to the Shepherds, upon the Birth of our *Saviour*; “*Behold, I bring you tidings of great Joy.*” When he had done speaking, he dropt a Paper, which contained the same words, down among the People.”

Now to whom, I would ask, did Cardinal *Panfilio* announce these—“*tidings of Great Joy?*” Was it not to the *People of ROME*? Yes, truly! And what

¹ “Each *Cardinal* has a Church, of which he is said to be *Titolare*; and so this of the Saints *Quiricus and Julita* gave *Title* to Cardinal *Conti*.”

was the nature of his *Annunciation* to them? Why, that “*we*” (*Romanists* or *Papists*) “*have a POPE!*” And pray what Order of being is he? Why an “*Innocent*” “*PONTIFEX OPTIMUS MAXIMUS,*” “*Priest of the Holy ROMAN Church,*” whose *Language* is *LATIN*, and he a *LATIN MAN*, who, although his *original Name* was *Michael Angelo*, must, upon his Assumption of the Papal Dignity, *renounce* both his *Baptismal* and *Family Names*, and be announced to the world by the *assumed, or fictitious Name* of *INNOCENT XIII.* And pray why does the *Pope* assume this *fictitious Title* of *INNOCENT*? Because a *Roman Sovereign Pontiff*, whose *Name* was *OSPORCO*, (that the obscurity of his *Family* might not be known) *changed his Name* to *SERGIO*, as the *Florentine History* informs us in the following words. ¹ “*After a few other Bishops,*” (says *Macchiavel,*) “*OSPORCO a ROMANE, aspired to the Papacy; who, for the homeliness of his Name, caused himself to be called SERGIO: which was the beginning why the Names of the Popes were changed at their Elections:*” and this elective custom, which *originated in Pride*, has been *continued by all succeeding Sovereign Roman Pontiffs.* And why does this practice continue? Because of *Antiquity*, and that we might be sure that the Pope is elected *κατ’ ἐξοκὴν*—“*The Most Reverend Father and Lord*” “*Innocent XIII.*” “*Priest of the Holy ROMAN CHURCH.*” Well, tell me what is the meaning of the “*ROMAN*

¹ See the *Florentine History* by *Nicholo Macchiavelli*, translated from the *Italian* into *English* by *Thomas Bedingfield, Esq.*, 1595.

CHURCH?" Why, the CHURCH of ROME to be sure. O ROMAN MAN; O LATIN MAN; O PAPAL MAN; "*out of thine own Mouth will I judge thee:*" Thou acknowledgest thyself that *thy* CHURCH is the 'ROMAN CHURCH,' ("*sacra ROMANA Ecclesia*") and *because it is the ROMAN, therefore it is also the LATIN Church*; for LATIN is Roman, and ROMAN is Latin, and LATIN is the canonized living universal Language of the Roman Church. But as to the Church of Christ, or of St. Peter the Apostle; KNOW, O POPE, that "THOU hast neither PART nor LOT in *this Matter*;" for although thou hast endeavoured to associate the humble Title of "*Servus Servorum Dei*," with the Pagan Blasphemous Title of '*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*,' yet canst thou not hide thy cloven Foot, nor thy "*Dragon Mouth*."

But we proceed with Mr. Edward Wright's observations concerning the Adoration paid to the '*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*.'

'In the Afternoon of the same Day his new Holiness went to St. Peter's Church to receive the THIRD ADORATION of the Cardinals [the two first had been made in the Chapel of SIXTUS IV. within the PALACE of the VATICAN) and to give his first Benediction to the People. His Holiness SAT on the Great Altar; then the Cardinal Dean (*Tanara*) beginning to chant the *Te Deum*, was followed by the Musicians of the Chapel. At the ADORATION, the Cardinals kiss the Pope's foot, then his Hand, and then his Cheek: the last they call being received *ad Osculum*

et *Amplexum* [to the Kiss and the Embrace;] for His Holiness at the same time Embraces them. As soon as the *Adoration* was over, and the Prayers usual on the occasion, all was concluded with the *Benediction*."

It is well remarked by 'Dr. Conyers Middleton' in a small work entitled '*A Letter from Rome*,' that

"Of all the Sovereign Pontiffs of Pagan Rome, it is very remarkable that CALIGULA was the first, who ever offered his Foot to be kissed by any, who approached him; which raised a general indignation through the City, to see themselves reduced to suffer so great an Indignity. Those who endeavoured to excuse it, said; that it was not done out of Insolence, but vanity; and for the sake of shewing his golden slipper, set with jewels. Seneca declaims upon it, in his usual manner, as the last affront to Liberty; and the introduction of a Persian Slavery into the manners of Rome.¹ Yet this servile act, unworthy either to be imposed or complied with by man, is now the standing ceremonial of Christian Rome, and a necessary condition of access to the Reigning Popes; though derived from no better origin, than the frantic pride of a brutal Pagan Tyrant."

From the foregoing *verbatim* account of Mr. Edward Wright concerning the *Adoration* of the Pope, which is corroborated by the testimony of Dr. Conyers Middleton, we deduce a most important

¹ Absoluto et gratias agenti porrexit osculandum sinistrum pedem—qui excusant, negant id insolentiæ causâ factum: aiunt socculum auratum, imo aureum, margaritis distinctum ostendere eum voluisse—natus in hoc, ut mores Civitatis Persica servitute mutaret, &c." Senec. de Benef. i. 2. 12.

Historical Fact; for therein we not only discover an *Exact Parallel* between *Popery* and *Paganism*; but also between the *words of St. Paul* and the *conduct of the Popes*. The Apostle Paul says, that, the ¹“*Man of Sin*,” the “*Son of Perdition*,” *opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped*; so that *HE as God, SITTETH in the TEMPLE OF GOD, shewing himself that HE IS GOD.*” And Mr. Wright says concerning the *Pope* that “*His Holiness SAT on the GREAT ALTAR in ST. PETER’S CHURCH*”—and—“*At the ADORATION the Cardinals kiss the Pope’s foot, then his Hand, and then his Cheek*,” &c. whereby we perceive that this *Papal* “*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*” is *worshipped and adored* by his Cardinals, and Courtiers in a *more servile manner* in *St. Peter’s Church*, (“*THE TEMPLE OF GOD*”) at *ROME*, than the *brutal Pagan Tyrant* and *Emperor CALIGULA* was *upon his Imperial Throne*. Wherefore, the *Pope* is *proved* to be incomparably the “*Man of Sin*,” and the “*Son of Perdition*,” by the *agreement of the Event* with *St. Paul’s prediction*. Now, is there *any example* on *Record* of *St. Peter’s kissing the foot*; then *the Hand*; and then *the Cheek of CHRIST*, before he spoke to his Master, who had a right (if any one had) to expect *this sort of homage* from his poor Disciple? Or, is there *any example* of any one of the *Apostles kissing the foot*, then *the Hand*, and lastly the *Cheek of St. Peter*, before they addressed him as their *Sovereign Pontiff*? We

¹ 2 Thessalonians ii. 3, 4.

know that the Apostle introduced no such *abominable* and *Idolatrous Custom* into the “*Temple of God*.” For in the case of *Peter*, and *Cornelius* the Centurion, we read, that, ¹ “as *Peter* was coming in, *Cornelius* met him, and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But *Peter* took him up, saying, *Stand up: I myself also am a Man*.” There is no mention of *St. Peter’s* foot being *kissed* on this occasion, neither do we read that *St. Peter* was ever SEATED (as the Pope now is) *on the “Great Altar”* “in the *Temple of God*,” either at *ROME*, or *JERUSALEM*, or *elsewhere*: but the Apostle in raising up *Cornelius*, plainly and honestly assured him that he was *only a Man*, and *not a God to be worshipped*. Whatever abundance of *Infallibility*, *Universality*, *Antiquity*, *Mystery*, or *Blasphemous Titles*, the *Latin Papal Hierarchy* may heap upon himself as Badges of peculiar Distinction, they must, *one and all*, be brought to the *Standard of Divine Truth*, and *there* we have the declaration of *Jehovah* himself concerning *CHRIST’S MISSION to the GENTILES*,² “*I AM THE LORD: that is MY NAME: and MY GLORY will I not give to ANOTHER*,” (viz. the *Pope*), “*neither my praise to graven Images*:” to wit, the *Image of St. Peter*, which is made out of an *old Statue of Jupiter*, and placed in the *Roman Basilique*, (dedicated to the Apostle,) the *toe* of which, although of *Metal*, is *nearly worn out* by the repeated *kissings of countless Pilgrims*, and *all Orders of Papistical Devotees*.

¹ Acts x. 25, 26.² Isaiah xlii. 8.

We perceive, then, by every view of the Question ; by a *Comparison* of the *Holy Scriptures* with the *Page of History*, that the *Latin Papistical* “ *Pontifex Optimus Maximus* ” has *required more homage, more Adoration, more genuflexion for Himself, than God, or Christ, or St. Peter, or any of the Inspired Apostles* : or even *than the Pagan Romans would countenance in the Person of the tyrannical Emperor CALIGULA*. The *Pope*, therefore, as the “ *Dux Gregis* ” of *Papists*, is surely “ *ANTICHRIST*,” in *requiring and receiving divine Honours on the one hand, and Titles which are wholly at variance with Christianity on the other*.

We have most clearly tracked this *Latin Pontifical* “ *Man*,” or ‘ *Lamb-horned* ’ *Beast* of the “ *EARTH*,” to his *Latin Ecclesiastical Seat and Sovereign Throne* “ *in the Temple of God* ” at *ROME*. And now let this “ *MAN*,” whose *Proper and Appellative Name* is *LATEINOS*, and “ *his Number 666*,” be assured of a ¹ “ *fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries* ; ” for his allotted *Reign* of “ *1260 Days* ” of *Years* has come to a close. Witness how much was accomplished at the *Time of the REFORMATION* : and how much has been effected by the *Instrumentality of France* since the years 1792 and 1830 ; for confirmation of the *former*, see ‘ *a Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government, by Richard Duppa. Second Edit. 1798.* ’ And of the *latter*, witness the *erasure of the VIth Article of the*

¹ Heb. x. 27.

French Charter, whereby the *Popish Church of Rome* ceased to be the *National Church of France*, and the Abdication of the *Crown of France* by the *Popish Priest-ridden Monarch* CHARLES the Xth, (August 2nd, 1830,) at RAMBOUILLET, the MANSION of a FRENCH PROTESTANT, who had fled to *England*, and taken up his Abode in *Kent*,¹ at the time of the *Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* by *Louis the XIVth*. So that *Charles the Xth*, the *Duke of Bordeaux*, *Monsieur*, the King's Brother, the *Duchess of Berry*, the *Duchess of Angoulême*, and all the old Branch of the BOURBONS, ceded their Right and Title to the POPISH KINGDOM of FRANCE in the HOUSE of a FRENCH PROTESTANT Refugee, which was applied for by the living *Hereditary Descendant* of the *House of Rambouillet*, after the *Restoration of Louis the XVIII*. but he was refused his patrimony by *Charles X*. According to the Laws of France, the *Crown* was considered an *Hereditary Right*, and *irreversible*, and, therefore, *England* waged war with *Buonaparte* and Restored the *Bourbon Line*; and by the same *Hereditary Law* the HOUSE and Property of *Rambouillet* ought to have been Restored to their Rightful Owner.

But to return from our digression. Mr. *Edward Wright* thus continues his description of the *Papal Coronation*.

² " On the 18th of the same month [May] was the CORONATION; before that ceremony a *Pontifical*

¹ See *Christian Guardian* for October 1831.

² *Wright's Travels*. Vol. i. p. 191.

Mass was celebrated by the Pope himself in the *Church of St. Peter*; *His Holiness* sucks the Sacramental Wine through a Tube; ALL OTHER PRIESTS and BISHOPS drink it out of the *Chalice*."

As there is no *foundation* in *Holy Writ* for the *Idolatrous custom* of *kissing the Foot*, the *Hand*, and the *Cheek* of the *Pope*, so neither is there for *His Holiness* (or rather *His Wickedness*, for so he is called by *St. Paul*, "*the Wicked One*,") to *suck* the *Sacramental Wine through a Tube*, because the *Primitive Institution* of the *Lord's Supper*, as set forth by *St. Matthew*, *St. Mark*, *St. Luke*, and *St. Paul*, enjoins not upon Christians any such ridiculous practice; for the word "*DRINK*" (and not *suck*) was the expression used both by *Christ* and his *Inspired Apostles*; and, therefore, let the Reader only be at the trouble to consult with attention that most admirable and unanswerable work¹ of "*Peter du Moulin, on the ANATOMY of the MASS*," wherein he sets forth no less than XXXIV. DIFFERENCES as existing between the *Papal Mass*, and the *Apostolical manner* of celebrating the *Lord's Supper*, and he will no longer wonder why the *English* of old time used to *convert the words*, "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*;" "*This is my body*:" into "*Hocus-pocus*."

But I must now proceed with the Account given us by *Mr. Wright* of the Ceremony of the *Pope's Coronation* after the celebration of the *Pontifical*

¹ ANATOMIE de la MESSE. Par Pierre Du Moulin. Chap. II. Cinquiesme Edition. A Charenton. 1647.

Mass, wherein we have an additional narrative of *Papal Elevation* and *Adoration*. Mr. Wright thus describes the scene :

¹ “ As the Pope was carried from the *Chapel of St. Gregory* (where were performed some Functions preparatory to the Mass) *exalted in his Chair* [the *Sedia Gestatoria*] with the *Baldachino*, or *Canopy*, over his head, and the *Flabelli* for driving away the Flies on each side, one of the Masters of the Ceremonies went before him with some *Flax* tied at the end of a long Cane, and one of the Clerks of the Chapel with a lighted Torch set fire to it; the Master of the Ceremonies at the same time pronouncing aloud these words, “ SANCTISSIME PATER, *sic transit Gloria Mundi*;” MOST HOLY FATHER, *thus passeth away the Glory of the World*. This ceremony was repeated *twice more*.”

Thus we notice that the *Pope* is not only *carried in State*, and receives *divine Adoration* from their *Eminences* the Cardinals, and sucks the Sacramental Wine through a Tube *differently from all other Priests* and *Bishops* of the *Latin Church*; but *permits the Master of the Ceremonies to proclaim aloud* (in the hearing of assembled Multitudes) “ SANCTISSIME PATER,” ‘ MOST HOLY FATHER.’ Thus the *Pope* tacitly allows himself to be *proclaimed* by an *Attribute peculiar to the Deity*, viz. “ MOST HOLY,” and, therefore, is the POPE *guilty of down-right Blasphemy*.

To whom belongeth the *lofty attribute* of “ MOST

¹ Wright's Travels. Vol. i, p. 191.

HOLY," but to the LORD GOD? But the POPE also assumeth the lofty attribute of "MOST HOLY" to *himself*: therefore the POPE assumeth an EQUALITY with the LORD GOD.

And, consequently, in the *person* and *Ecclesiastical character* of the *Pope of Rome* is fulfilled this prophecy of *St. Paul*,¹ "That HE" (viz. "The Man of Sin," "the Son of Perdition," "the Mystery of Iniquity," "the Wicked One,") "as God" (in the character of GOD "MOST HOLY") "SITTETH in the Temple of God, showing himself that HE IS GOD;" which the *Pope* abundantly manifests by the *Divine adoration* which he commonly receives in *St. Peter's Church* and at the *Vatican Palace*, as well as in the *public streets of Rome*, from their *Eminences the Cardinals*, from the *Emperors, Kings, Princes, and Nobles* of the *whole Roman earth*, and from *all persons* whatsoever, when they approach near to 'His (Sovereign Pontifical) Holiness,' or 'Most Holy Father.' This fact is confirmed by the assumption of the *Divine Attribute* "MOST HOLY," as well as the *Divine Title* of "RULER OF THE WORLD," with many other titles which he most impiously assumes, as if they belonged to him by *divine right*: whereas, *those bestowed on him* by *St. Paul* and *St. John* are of a different nature, to wit, "The Man of Sin," "the Son of Perdition," "the Mystery of Iniquity," "the Wicked One," "Antichrist," "the Beast," "the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth," *Dragon Mouth*: with

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 4. . .

a number of other epithets indicative of his utter vileness.

But to continue the History of the *Papal Coronation*, as related by Mr. *Wright*, when the *Pope* receives the *pallium*, or *pall*, from the *first Deacon*.

¹ ‘ The *Pope* was carried to the great altar; there, after confession for the *Mass*, and some usual prayers, he received the *pall* from the first Deacon, with these words, *Accipe PALLIUM, sc. Plenitudinem Pontificalis Officii, ad honorem Omnipotentis DEI, et gloriosissimæ VIRGINIS Mariæ ejus Matris, et Beatorum Apostolorum PETRI et PAULI, et Sanctæ ROMANÆ Ecclesiæ. Receive thou the PALL, namely, the PLENITUDE of the PONTIFICAL OFFICE, to the honour of Almighty God, of the most Glorious Virgin Mary his Mother, and of the blessed Apostles PETER and PAUL, and of the Holy ROMAN Church.*’

The receiving of the *pall*, which is the *cloak* or *mantle of state*, may well be termed by *Papists* the *PLENITUDE of the PONTIFICAL OFFICE*, since it not only embraces the *highest earthly titles*, but likewise *heavenly*, such as ‘ *Sanctissimus Pater,*’ ‘ *Rector Orbis,*’ ‘ *Vice-Deo,*’ ‘ *Divinæ Majestatis,*’ &c. &c. It also includes *Divine Adoration*, and the appropriating of (what is not in the province of an earthly being to bestow) a *divine attribute* to the *Virgin Mary*, by calling her ‘ *Gloriosissima*’ (*the most Glorious*), although the *superlative degree* is never used concerning her in the *New Testament*; and by further calling *Mary*, ‘ *the Mother of Almighty God,*’

¹ *Wright's Travels*, vol. i. p. 192.

(‘ ad honorem omnipotentis Dei, et *Gloriossissimæ Virginis Mariæ ejus Matris*’) which are *Titles of Blasphemy* when applied to a *mortal being*, such as *Mary* was ; for *Jesus* thus addressed his *Mother* in *Cana of Galilee*, before he had performed his first miracle of changing water into wine, ¹“ WOMAN, what have I to do with THEE ?” and when upon the cross, *Jesus* said to his *Mother*, ²“ WOMAN, behold thy Son !” Besides which, the NAME of CHRIST is *not mentioned* in this ‘ *plenitude of the Pontifical office to the honour of Almighty God* :’ wherefore, by the OMISSION of the NAME of CHRIST, the ‘ *Pontifical office*’ virtually *supersedes* that of CHRIST, and the Pope becomes, *de facto*, ANTICHRIST *in office*. How ‘ the *plenitude of the Pontifical office*’ can be said to be ‘ to the *honour of Almighty God*,’ when the NAME of CHRIST is *not mentioned* in THAT OFFICE, I cannot comprehend, unless it is to be understood that the Pope, as the *visible and supreme head* of the *Holy Roman Church* is to be honoured as *Almighty God* ; and certainly no higher degree of adoration can possibly be *bestowed* on any *created being*, than that which the Popes *require and receive*, from the *Emperors, Kings, Princes, Cardinals, &c.* of the *Latin Roman Church*, and some of their *courtiers* have even said in their presence—

³ ‘ *Divinæ Majestatis tuæ conspectus.*’

‘ The countenance of thy *Divine Majesty.*’

¹ John ii. 4.

² John xix. 25, 26.

³ Orat. Puccii. in Sess. 9. Concil. Lateram. sub Leo X. ap. Sur. ipso limine.

¹ ‘*Omnem tibi uni in Cœlo et in Terrâ traditam à Domino Potestatem.*’

‘All Power is delivered by the Lord to *thee alone*, both in heaven and upon earth.’

² ‘*Tu denique Alter Deus in Terris.*’

‘*Another God upon Earth.*’

³ ‘*Nec Deus es, nec Homo ; quasi Neuter es inter utrumque.*’

‘O Pope, thou art not God nor man ; *thy part*

‘*Is neither : but betwixt them both thou art.*’

In corroboration of the above sentences I shall adduce *one* which I copied with my own hand (during my residence in *Paris*, in 1830), from a beautifully *enamelled tablet* of *great antiquity*, representing a *Trinity* of Persons. From the exquisite manner in which the whole of it was finished, as well as the *abbreviated style* in which the *Latin words* were written upon it, I suppose that it must have been executed when *Popery* was *in its zenith*. The *three characters* which composed this *Trinity* were, 1st. *the Holy Ghost*, in the *likeness of a dove*, with a radiated glory around it. 2dly. *Our Lord Jesus Christ* in the *likeness of a Man*, with a radiated glory around his head : this figure is placed on the *right side of the Dove*. And 3dly. *the Pope*, dressed in full canonicals, with the *Triple Tiara* on his head, and the *Keys of St. Peter* in his hand : this figure is placed on the *left side of the Dove*. And then the

¹ Orat. Puccii. in Sess. 9. Concil. Lateram. &c.

² Orat. Marcell. in 4 Sess. Concil. Latèram. sub Jul. II. ap. sur.

³ Clement. Procem. in Gloss. prop. fin.

following words, explanatory of the subject, were placed *above* and *below* the hieroglyphic:—

‘ *Sancta Trinitas*, UNUS DEUS: an Te invocemus; an Te adoremus; Te laudamus; Te glorificamus; *O beata Trinitas*, subnomen DEI UNIUS.’

‘ *Holy Trinity*, ONE GOD: whether we invoke Thee; whether we adore Thee; we praise Thee; we glorify Thee; *O blessed Trinity*, under the name of the ONE GOD,’

Thus the *Pope* became “*as God*,” in the mind of the person who designed and executed this antique, representing the *Papal Trinity*. A *Jesuit* might say, that ‘*an enemy hath done this*,’ but the *unbounded power* which the *Popes* have *assumed* and *exercised* in times past, “*over the kings of the earth*,” (that is, the *Ten Horns*), as well as the beautiful manner in which it is finished, would amply justify the integrity of this *hieroglyphic*, without a *comment* or *gloss* upon the subject; for the “*Ten Horns*” or “*Kings*” of the *Apocalyptic Roman Earth* had then¹ “ONE MIND, and gave their POWER, and STRENGTH, and KINGDOM unto the *Beast*.” If the Epithets and Attributes assumed by, or bestowed upon the *Popes* do not *justify the belief* that the *claims* of the *Papacy* are those of *Infallibility* and *GODLIKE*, we shall fail to establish the belief of any fact. But, *she does lay claim to them*, as her *Latin Language* witnesseth, in terms which cannot be applied to a *Being* which is not *more than mortal*. Give ear then to the voice of the *Second Roman Beast* of the *LATIN*

¹ Rev. xvii. 13, 17.

Earth, for ¹ “ *He had two Horns like a Lamb, and HE SPAKE AS A DRAGON!!!* ” ‘ *Alter Deus in Terris,* ’ ‘ *Vice-Deo super Terram,* ’ ‘ *Divinæ Majestatis tuæ conspectus,* ’ ‘ *Nec Deus es, nec Homo ; quasi Neuter es inter utrumque,* ’ ‘ *Omnem Tibi Uni in Cælo et in Terrâ traditam à Domino Potestatem,* ’ ‘ *Sanctissimus Pater,* ’ ‘ *Pater Principum et Regum : Rector Orbis,* ’ ‘ *Pontifex Optimus Maximus,* ’ ‘ *Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Pater ac Dominus,* ’ ‘ *Episcopus Orbis,* ’ ‘ *Vicarius Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi in Terrâ,* ’ &c. &c. In *Italy* the Pope is commonly called ‘ *Our Lord God the Pope,* ’ which is in agreement with a *Greek Epithet* bestowed on him by *commentators*, Θεός εἰμι ἐπὶ γαίης, ‘ *I am God upon earth,* ’ which latter contains the *exact Number* χξς’, 666. And that the *Pope is worshipped ‘ as God,* ’ the *kissing of his foot is confirmation enough* to establish his *PRETENDED DIVINITY*. What *greater adoration* can be *given or required by the Deity* from *mortal men* than that which is *paid to the Pope of Rome*, when *sitting on the high altar in St. Peter’s Church*, or the *Vatican Palace*? Can there be any *reasonable doubt* as to *whom the Apostle St. Paul alluded*, when he *warned the Thessalonians of the coming of ANTICHRIST* in these words, ² “ *Let no man deceive you by any means ; for THAT DAY shall NOT COME, EXCEPT there come a FALLING AWAY FIRST, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped ; so that*

¹ Rev. xiii. 11.² 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

He as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that HE IS GOD ?" May we not say in the words of *Job* concerning *Leviathan*,¹ " Upon EARTH there is not HIS LIKE: he beholdeth all high things: he is a KING over all the children of pride." Yet frightful indeed as is such language of blasphemy tolerated by the Pope, what shall we say to the following command addressed by the *Abbé Edgworth* to *Louis XVI.* on the scaffold ?

2 ' *Son of St. Louis, ascend to heaven !*'

If the *Power* of an *Abbé* be such that he can command the departing soul of a KING to 'ascend to Heaven,' what must be the *Power of the Pope*? Reasoning according to the ratio of degrees between an *Abbé* and the *Pope*, the power of the latter must be "as God," and according to prediction, the Pope "sheweth himself that he is God," and, therefore, we need not question further whether it is "He that should come?" For he is revealed in his time, in the [NOW] *Church of Rome*, which is "the Synagogue of Satan," and *Mystic Babylon*, and the *Mystical Name* LATEINOS is put upon him, his *Church*, and his *Kingdom*; and let him try the experiment of *Miracles*, to do away with this branded "Mark" if he be able: but, as the *Word of God* is infallibly true, so he must surrender up his ecclesiastical *Kingdom*, and go to his "appointed place," the reward of his Apostacy, even as *Judas* did.

But I must now continue with Mr. *Wright's* description of the *Papal Coronation ceremony*.

¹ *Job* xli. 33, 34.

² See M. Hue and Clery's Journal, p. 35.

¹ ‘ *His Holiness* (says Mr. Wright) then going up to the altar, kissed it, and blessed the incense in the censer, and incensed the altar, and one of the Cardinal-Deacons incensed him. He then went and seated himself in his *Pontifical Chair*, or *Throne*, which was placed about a dozen yards from the altar, looking towards it, and received the Cardinals again *All’ Adoratione*, or *Obedienza*, as they more particularly call this. *The Cardinals kissed his foot and hand*, and were all admitted *All’ Amplesso*, as before: the *Prelates* kissed his *foot and knee*; the *Penitentiaries of St. Peter* his *foot only*. Then after some hymns and suffrages, *His Holiness* celebrated the *Mass*. When that was done, he took the gloves and ring, and twenty-six Julios (about sixpence a-piece), in a rich purse, offered him by Cardinal *Annibale Albani*, in the name of the Chapter, *Pro bene cantatâ Missâ* [for having *chanted the Mass well*], which he gave to one of the *Cardinal-Deacons*. After this, he was *carried* in the same *state* to the *Loggia della Beneditione*, where he *sat* in his *Pontifical Chair*, in full view of the vast crowd of spectators, with which the great *Piazza* below was filled, where all the pomp of *Rome* was united, in the rich coaches of the Nobility. After some hymns and prayers, *one of the Cardinal-Deacons* took the MITRE off his head, and *another* put on the TRIREGNO, or TRIPLE CROWN, with these words (as I was informed afterwards, for he did not thunder it out, as Cardinal *Pamfilio* did the

¹ Wright’s Travels, vol. i. p. 192, 193.

Proclamation), ¹ ‘ *Accipe TIARAM, TRIBUS CORONIS ORNATAM, et scias TE ESSE PATREM PRINCIPUM et REGUM, RECTOREM ORBIS, in Terrâ Vicarium Salvatoris nostri, Jesu Christi; cui Honor est, et Gloria in Sæcula Seculorum. Amen.*’ ‘Receive thou the *Tiara*, adorned with THREE CROWNS, and know THYSELF to be the *Father of Princes and of Kings, RULER of the WORLD, upon EARTH Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ; to whom be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. Amen.*’

‘For two or three nights upon this occasion, the *City of Rome* was perfectly on fire with *illuminations* of all sorts; the Nobility and all the people striving who should testify most zeal and joy on this *accession*, for the new created Pope was a man very agreeable to the people of *Rome*, as being a ROMAN born, brother to the *Duke of Poli*, of a most ancient Family, out of which they reckon twelve Popes to have been, since the Family-Name was *Conti*, and four more while it was *Anicia*, the ancient name of it, from which they say it was changed to *Conti*, from the great number of *Counts* that were then of it, above a thousand years ago.’

Here then we have the Nobility and all the people of *Rome* striving who should testify the most zeal and joy on the *Accession* of the *new Pope*, by illuminations of all sorts for two or three nights; and from the circumstance of one of the Cardinal-Deacons *taking off the MITRE*, and then *another Cardinal-*

¹ ‘*Accipe Tiaram,*’ &c. For confirmation of these words consult *Voyages du Sr. A. De La Motraye en Europe*, &c. Tom. i. p. 10. chap. 16.

Deacon placing the *TIARA* or *TRIPLE CROWN* on the *Head of the Pope*, accompanied by a *distinct Proclamation* (*Accipe TIARAM, TRIBUS CORONIS ORNATAM, &c.*), we know for a *certainty* that the *Roman* or *Latin* ‘*Pontifex Optimus Maximus*’ is both an *Ecclesiastical* and *Temporal Sovereign*, and that the *Pope* has succeeded to the *Temporal Kingdom of Rome*, and has thus imitated the *Idolatrous Custom* of the *Pagan Roman Emperors* who were anciently styled by the Title of ‘*Pontifex Maximus*.’ Wherefore we have a complete Narrative and Developement of the *ELECTION, PROCLAMATION, ANNUNCIATION, ADORATION, CORONATION, EXALTATION, and ENTHRONEMENT* of this *compound Mysterious Latin Papal Man*, with the *Place and Manner of his sitting in state*, viz. “*in the Temple of God*” at *ROME*, “*shewing himself that he*” (in his ecclesiastical character and capacity) “*is God*.” If, (in addition to the customary homage of genuflexion,) *kissing the foot, the knee, the hand, and face of a Pope* is not *IDOLATRY*, we shall labour in vain to *establish the fact*: but we have established it by the opinion of a *Pagan*, even *Seneca*, who reproved the *Pagan Emperor CALIGULA* most sharply for permitting the *Pagan Senators and Courtiers of Old Rome* to bow down to, or kiss the Emperor’s *elegant slipper studded with jewels*. But the *Papists* have an easier way of solution, by *dividing the Tenth Commandment* (given on Mount Sinai to Moses) into two *Parts*, and *omitting the Second*, which relates to the *worshipping and bowing down to IMAGES and RELICS*, knowing

that *Peter* refused to be worshipped by *Cornelius*, and the *Angel* by *St. John*, and that the *Second Commandment* subverts their *Idolatrous Practices*. In the year 1830, I was in *Paris*, in the *Easter Week*, and in the *Church of St. Roch*, I saw a wooden *crucifix* exhibited on *Good Friday*, at the *Altar*, and several *Priests* in *succession* came and bowed down to it, kissing the *head*, *body*, and *feet* of the full-length figure of *Christ* which was upon it. The CONSECRATED WAFER in the *Papal MASS* is bowed down to and worshipped, the people supposing that the *Real Presence of Christ* is *there*; whereas, it is *nothing but the Pope*, and the emanations of his Supremacy and Infallibility, in and over the Latin Church, whose Members act in concert with their *Latin Head*, doing as *Papa* and *his Councils* command. But how a *wafer*, which is made of *flour and water*, can be *transubstantiated* into the *literal Body of Christ*, is an affair too mysterious to be explained or believed, as the Papists must know; for this *Mystical-Wafer Deity* is *locked up in a Pix*, and *this God* is not known to be such by the people, until a little *trumpety bell rings* at the *High Altar*, to announce it to the *Congregation*, at which time they all fall down and worship this *God of paste*. As, therefore, it is said of the *Pope* when he is elected, '*quem creant, adorant*;' '*whom they create, they adore*;' so it may equally be said of the *consecrated Host* (or *Wafer*) which they preserve in a *Pix*, '*quem creant, adorant*;' '*whom they create, they adore*.' So that *Papists* first create a *Paste God*,

then they *bow down to him and worship him*, and afterwards *devour him in the MASS, or Roman Sacrament*. This is certain, that if *one consecrated wafer* becomes the *literal Body of Christ*, as Papists affirm (‘*Hoc est Corpus meum,*’ ‘*this is my body*’), so, by the same rule (*Transubstantiation*), *all consecrated wafers* must become the *literal Bodies of Christ*; and, therefore, according to the *Number of Papists* who partake of the *Roman Catholic MASS*, so is the *Number of Christs* which are devoured (*flesh and blood*) on *every Sabbath Day* throughout the year, besides *Fast Days*, which must be innumerable, for Papists have as many as *seven different MASSES* in one day, and oftentimes *without one communicant*. Who cannot see that this is *Hocus Pocus* work. If the *wafer* is meant to represent the *literal Sacrifice of Christ’s body*, (and Papists pointedly call their Sacrament, the ‘*Sacrifice of the Mass,*’) then it is *Bloodless*, for the Priests *deny the Cup* to the *Laity*, by *drinking it themselves*, which renders the sacrifice of none effect to the *Laity*. A *French Roman Catholic*, when soliciting his wife or his friend to partake of the *ordinance of the Mass*, would say, ‘*Voulez-vous manger le bon Dieu aujourd’hui ?*’ ‘*Will you eat the good God to-day ?*’ This is no burlesque, but truth. I recollect a conversation which I had in *Paris* with a *French Roman Catholic Priest*, of good sense and urbanity of manner, on the subject of *Transubstantiation*, which was somewhat to the following effect: I asked him whether he thought that *Christ* (whilst he sat at supper with his

twelve Disciples, which event happened before Christ had suffered death upon the cross,) took up his own *literal Body* in his hands, and then *brake his own literal Body* into twelve pieces, and then gave to each of the twelve Disciples a portion of his own *literal Body*? Because Christ said, ¹ “Take eat; *this is my Body.*” Or, did he think that Christ gave his twelve Disciples his *literal blood to drink*, whilst it was yet *flowing in his veins*? For he had not, when he uttered these words, shed his blood upon the cross for man’s Redemption. The Priest shook his head, as if the *Question* was *profane*. But Christ’s blood could have been of no avail before he had offered himself in sacrifice to his Father: for ² “*Without the shedding of Blood there is no Remission*” of sins. The *Abbé* confessed it was a *great Mystery*, and I agreed with him that it was so in the *literal, or carnal sense* in which he understood it; but that I viewed the subject in a *spiritual sense*; for it was the former which staggered the *Faith of the Jews*, insomuch that “*many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him,*” as may be seen in the VIth Chapter of St. John’s Gospel; but Christ explained to them his meaning of the terms “*Flesh*” and “*Blood*” in the 63rd verse of the same chapter, by saying, “*It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life.*” And the IXth and Xth Chapters of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews have for ever

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26.² Heb. ix. 22.

set aside all future *sacrifices of Christ's Body*; as the following words of the *Holy Spirit* testify.

¹ "Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of Goats and Calves, but *by his own blood he entered in ONCE* into the holy place, having *obtained eternal Redemption* for us." "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; *nor yet that He should offer Himself OFTEN*, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must He *often* have suffered since the foundation of the world: but *now ONCE* in the end of the world hath he appeared to *put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself*. And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was *ONCE OFFERED* to bear the sins of many." Again:—"We are sanctified through the *offering of the BODY* of *Jesus Christ ONCE for all*." "This Man, after He had *offered One Sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by *One Offering* he hath perfected for ever, them that are sanctified. Whereof the *Holy Ghost* also is a *witness to us*." So true and convincing are these words that even a *Roman Catholic Child* in Ireland, when *reading them*, affirmed, that the *Protestants* had

¹ Heb. ix. 11, 12; 24—28; x. 10—15.

placed these two Chapters in the Bible on purpose to do away with the MASS. But whosoever will Read the Bible attentively and with a child-like simplicity (understanding the Tenets of Popery) will confess that such a system is *Anti-christian, Satanic* and *Idolatrous*, and that the Bible and Papists cannot both be true, for either the one or the other must be false. But it has been shown already which of them is false, and LATEINOS shall be our *Day-Star*, for the *Night of Popish Darkness* is passed and “*the True Light now shineth,*” and will shine, “*more and more unto the Perfect Day.*” And though the *Political Horizon* of the *British Empire* seems to be lowering a little in consequence of the criminal introduction of the dark children of the *Roman Church* into our *Protestant Constitution*, yet, be it remembered that, the indelible stigma LATEINOS is not only written upon her *Roman Babylonish Latin Papal Man*, but upon every individual Papist; and those who cannot see the *Mark, Name, and Number* of the *Beast*, must be totally ignorant of the Bible, which the Papists have locked up in the *Latin Language* to prevent the discovery. IRELAND can never be godly and quietly governed, so long as the principles of the *Church of Rome* predominate, for they are wholly at variance with *christian Peace*, and *national safety*, (as the fiendish Jesuits and Popes have ever proved to all Europe during the “1260 Days” of Years,) and this is a sure sign that the *Church of Rome* is *Anti-christian*. Let Protestants of England regard these true

words of *God's Holy Spirit* concerning the *Roman Papal Beast*.¹ “And the third Angel followed them, saying, *with a loud voice*, IF ANY MAN *worship the Beast and His Image*, and *receive his Mark* in his forehead, or in his hand, the *same* shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the Cup of his indignation; and *he* shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy Angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of *their* torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and *they* have no rest day or night, who *worship the Beast and His Image*, and WHOSOEVER *receiveth the MARK* of HIS NAME;” which has been proved to be LATEINOS.

May we not then with the utmost propriety apply to *Romanists* the highly-significant words in St. Paul's *Epistle* to the ROMANS, where the Apostle reasons against PAGAN ROMAN IDOLATRY.² “*Professing themselves* to be wise,” [viz. *Papists of Rome*,] “*they became fools*, and *changed the Glory* of the *uncorruptible God* into an IMAGE” [the *Pope*] “*made like to corruptible Man* :” [the *Pope* :] “*who changed the TRUTH of GOD into a LIE*, and *worshipped*” [the *Pope*] “*and served the Creature*” [the *Pope*] “*MORE than the CREATOR, who is blessed for ever. Amen.*”

St. Paul in his *Epistle to the ROMANS* tells the *Gentile Christian CHURCH OF ROME* (if a CHURCH of ROME there was, in his day, which he does not affirm, as when he writes his *Epistles* to the *Corin-*

¹ Rev. xiv. 9—11.

² Romans i. 22, 23, 25.

thians, Galatians, &c. but merely addresses himself to *believers in Christ* dwelling in the *City of Rome*, after this manner. ¹“*To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be Saints, &c., and afterwards adds these words :—*”²“*I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also,*”) of the exceeding great *Advantages* and *privileges* of the *JEWS* above the *Gentiles* :—³“*ISRAELITES ; to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promises ; whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.*” But he adds, that the former had *nationally forfeited* all these *ancient privileges* by reason of their “*UNBELIEF.*”⁴“*Because of UNBELIEF THEY were BROKEN OFF.*” However, *St. Paul* reminds the *Gentile Christians of Rome*, that, because of these *ancient Promises of God made to the Israelites*, the *JEWS* were the *ORIGINAL* and *TRUE* “*OLIVE TREE*” *from which* “*CHRIST came*” or *descended*, as *Jesus* testified⁵“*Salvation is of the Jews ;*” but that “*SOME of the Branches*” were “*broken off*” in order to the *Ingrafting* of the *Gentiles*, (⁶“*I speak to you Gentiles,*” viz. of *Rome*, “*inasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles,*”) whom he designates “*a wild Olive Tree,*” and he then *WARNS* the *GENTILE Church of Rome*, that⁷“*If God spared not the Natural Branches, take heed lest He also spare not*

¹ Rom. i. 7.² Ibid 15.³ Rom. ix. 4, 5.⁴ Rom. xi. 20.⁵ John iv. 22.⁶ Rom. xi. 13.⁷ Ibid 21.

THEE." For although *God* had manifested his *severity* to the utmost upon the TEMPLE, CITY and NATION of the JEWS for their "UNBELIEF;" nevertheless the Apostle tells the *Gentile Christian Church* (consisting of "*a Congregation of faithful men*") at ROME, that it *only* STOOD BY FAITH. "THOU" [*Gentile Church of ROME*] "STANDEST BY FAITH," and that a *departure* from *that Faith* would bring upon IT a sentence of severity *similar* to that which was executed upon the CHURCH of JERUSALEM; that is, IT should be "CUT OFF." "Towards THEE, (Gentile Church of ROME,) GOODNESS, if THOU CONTINUE IN HIS GOODNESS: OTHERWISE THOU ALSO SHALT BE CUT OFF." That the *Papal Church of ROME* has "*departed from the Faith*" has been proved in a variety of particulars, as compared with the *word of God*; therefore, SHE *no longer* "STANDS BY FAITH, *not having* "CONTINUED in GOD'S GOODNESS," and consequently "SHALL BE CUT OFF."

In *conclusion*: that the Reader may not for an instant suppose that I have been speaking in my own spirit, I will place before him the CONDITIONS on which the GENTILE CHURCH of ROME would have continued upon the *original Stock* of the TRUE OLIVE-TREE, according to the *words of St. Paul* in his EPISTLE to the ROMANS.

¹ "I speak to you *Gentiles*" [viz. at Rome] "*inasmuch as I am* THE APOSTLE of the GENTILES. If *some* of the *Branches* be broken off, and THOU,"

¹ Romans xi. 23.

² Ibid 13, 17—22.

[*Gentile Church of Rome*,] “being a *wild Olive Tree*, wert grafted in among them,” [the *Jews*] “and with them partakest of the *Root and Fatness* of the OLIVE-TREE ; BOAST NOT” [*Gentile Church of Rome*] “against the *Branches*. But if THOU boast, [*Gentile Church of Rome*,] THOU bearest not the *Root*, but the *Root THEE*. THOU wilt say then,” [*Gentile Church of Rome*,] “The *Branches* were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well ; because of UNBELIEF they were broken off, and THOU” [*Gentile Church of Rome*] STANDEST BY FAITH. Be not HIGH-MINDED ; but fear : for if God spared not the NATURAL BRANCHES, [the *Jews*,] “TAKE HEED lest he also SPARE NOT THEE. Behold therefore” [O *Gentile Church of Rome*] “the goodness and severity of God : on them which fell,” [the *Jews*,] “SEVERITY ; but towards THEE,” [*Gentile Church of Rome*,] “GOODNESS, IF THOU CONTINUE” [*these are the CONDITIONS*] “IN HIS GOODNESS : OTHERWISE THOU ALSO” [*Gentile Church of Rome*] “SHALT BE CUT OFF.”

Clear thyself then, if thou be able, thou *Papal Latin Vatican Monster*, from the application of these *Prophetic words of St. Paul*, to the *Pseudo-Apostolic Church of Rome*, which are FULFILLED in thy long continued UNBELIEF and *Apostacy*, viz. 1260 years. Thou hast given GOD the lie till the *Heart sickens* at THY BLASPHEMY, and I tell thee in HIS MIGHTY NAME, (for “HE is KING of Kings and LORD of Lords,”) that thou art not his Vicar, but the ARCH-ANTICHRIST, even the “MAN” whose

Appellative "NAME" or "MARK" is LATEINOS, and thy *enigmatical Number* χξς', or 666. Thou knowest (or I will tell thee) that THOU *hast* NOT "CONTINUED IN GOD'S GOODNESS," but hast signally ¹ "*departed from the Faith* in the LATTER TIMES," by *forbidding* MARRIAGE and *commanding* to *abstain from* MEATS, and instead of *Preaching the Faith of Christ crucified*, as Paul did at Rome, thou "SITTEST in the Temple of God," there to be "*worshipped*." Thou hast indeed "*boasted thyself against the Natural Branches*," as thy thundering Bulls from the Vatican have *testified again and again* to all Europe. And thinkest thou, O Pope, that thy MYSTICAL ROMAN CHURCH shall *not be* "CUT OFF?" Yea, as certainly as it was *predicted* concerning Jerusalem and her Temple, before the Event had come to pass, that ² "*there shall not be left ONE STONE upon another that shall not be thrown down*;" so likewise the *prediction* concerning ³ "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT," "THAT GREAT CITY," ROME OR BABYLON, is, that SHE shall be "THROWN DOWN," and shall "BE FOUND NO MORE AT ALL." As the *Prediction* of the former has had its *literal* fulfilment, so must the *latter*.

"Take heed," therefore, O Latin Pope of Rome, for God did not spare the Natural Branches, neither will he spare THEE: for thy Latin, Roman, Papal CHURCH and KINGDOM; thy Roman City, with the period of thy Ecclesiastical Reign, are NUMBERED;

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1—3.

² Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. Mark xiii. 1, 2.

³ Compare Rev. xvii. 5, 18, with Rev. xviii. 21.

and the words which the *Prophet Daniel* addressed to *Belshazzar*, the *proud King of Euphratean Babylon*, may be equally applied to *Thee*, the *Proud Sovereign Pontiff* of "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT;" that is to say, ¹"MENE; TEKEL;" which, according to the Interpretation of *Daniel*, is this, "MENE; God hath numbered thy Kingdom," [at "1260 Days" of Years,] "and finished it," [in the reign of Pope "PIUS SIXTUS," A. D. 1798.] TEKEL; *Thou art weighed in the balances*, and art found wanting;" as thy NAME LATEINOS shall evidence to all generations.

Moreover; in another passage of his Inspired Writings, *St. Paul* speaks of the Punishment of the "*Man of Sin*," "*the Son of Perdition*," "*the Mystery of Iniquity*," (proved to be the *Pope of Rome*,) after this manner, "That WICKED ONE, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his Mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." And *St. John* tells us of the dire punishment and Annihilation of the *Beast*, whose *Ecclesiastical City* is upon the "SEVEN MOUNTAINS of ROME, in the avenging of God's people persecuted by the Blasphemous Latin Papal Tyrannical Babylonish Roman Church and "MAN," whose Appellative is LATEINOS and his Number "666." And as *St. Paul* designates this *Ecclesiastical Hierarch* by the Title of the "SON of PERDITION," so *St. John* says, ²"THE BEAST" (whose Number is 666) "GOETH into PERDITION:" and ³"Her Plagues

¹ Dan. v. 25.² Rev. xvii. 8.³ Ibid. xviii. 8.

shall come in *one Day, Death, and Mourning, and Famine*; and SHE shall be UTTERLY BURNED WITH FIRE: for *strong is the LORD GOD who judgeth HER.*" ¹ "And a *Mighty Angel* took up a *Stone* like a *great Millstone*, and *cast it into the Sea, saying, Thus with VIOLENCE* shall that *GREAT CITY BABYLON* be THROWN DOWN, and shall be FOUND NO MORE AT ALL." Wherefore, the *Holy Spirit*, speaking by the Mouth of *St. John*, saith, ² "COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE, THAT YE BE NOT PARTAKERS OF HER SINS, and THAT YE RECEIVE NOT OF HER PLAGUES."

³ "Blessed," then "is he that *Readeth*, and they that *hear the Words of this Prophecy*, and *keep those things which are written therein*: for THE TIME IS AT HAND."

¹ Rev. xviii. 21.

² Ibid. 4.

³ Ibid. i. 3.

THE END.

I.—TABLE OF NUMERALS.

A TABLE exhibiting the numerical value of *each* of the 24 LETTERS of the *Greek Alphabet*, with the addition of the 3 *Numerical Cyphers* denominated *επισημον* *Ταυ*, *Κοππα*, and *Σανπι*, distinguished by a small mark placed *above* or *below* them, as [*ι*] and which points out their individual Arithmetical value according to the *Mode of Calculation* adopted by the *Ancient Greeks*. N. B. The *Cyphers*, or *Episèmons* are only introduced to supply a deficiency in the *Greek Alphabet*, viz. to make up *units*, *tens*, and *hundreds*, &c. If the mark be *above* the *Letter* or *Episèmon*, then the said *Letter* belongs to the *Class of Units*, *Tens*, and *Hundreds*: if *below*, to the *Class of Thousands*, &c.

I. UNITS.		II. TENS.		III. HUNDREDS.	
A. α' equals	1	I. ι' equals ..	10	P. ρ' equals	100
B. β' =	2	K. κ' =	20	Σ. σ' = ..	200
Γ. γ' =	3	Λ. λ' =	30	T. τ' = ..	300
Δ. δ' =	4	M. μ' =	40	Υ. υ' = ..	400
E. ε' =	5	N. ν' =	50	Φ. φ' = ..	500
επισημον <i>Ταυ</i> } = 6		Ξ. ξ' =	60	X. χ' = ..	600
V. ς. ζ' }		O. ο' =	70	Ψ. ψ' = ..	700
Z. ζ' =	7	Π. π' =	80	Ω. ω' = ..	800
H. η' =	8	Κοππα <i>Τ.Σ. ϛ'</i> = 90		σ αν πι <i>Θ'</i> =	900
Θ. θ' =	9				
I. THOUSANDS.		II. TENS OF THOUSANDS.		III. HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS.	
A. α equals ..	1,000	I. ι equals ..	10,000	P. ρ equals ..	100,000
B. β =	2,000	K. κ =	20,000	Σ. σ =	200,000
Γ. γ =	3,000	Λ. λ =	30,000	T. τ =	300,000
Δ. δ =	4,000	M. μ =	40,000	Υ. υ =	400,000
E. ε =	5,000	N. ν =	50,000	Φ. φ =	500,000
επισημον <i>Ταυ</i> } = 6,000		Ξ. ξ =	60,000	X. χ =	600,000
V. ς. ζ }		O. ο =	70,000	Ψ. ψ =	700,000
Z. ζ =	7,000	Π. π =	80,000	Ω. ω =	800,000
H. η =	8,000	Κοππα <i>Τ.Σ. ϛ</i> 90,000		σ αν πι <i>Θ</i> = ..	900,000
Θ. θ =	9,000				

II.—SCALE OF COMBINATIONS.

A TABLE of the COMBINATION of NUMBERS, as set forth in the *Eton, Westminster, Port Royal*, and other *Greek Grammars*, to which I beg to refer my readers for an *explanation*.

	α'	β'	γ'	δ'	ε'	ς'	ζ'	η'	θ'
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ι'	ια'	ιβ'	ιγ'	ιδ'	ιε'	ις'	ιζ'	ιη'	ιθ'
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
κ'	κα'	κβ'	κγ'	κδ'	κε'	κς'	κζ'	κη'	κθ'
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
λ'	λα'	λβ'	λγ'	λδ'	λε'	λς'	λζ'	λη'	λθ'
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
μ'	μα'	μβ'	μγ'	μδ'	με'	μς'	μζ'	μη'	μθ'
40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
ν'	να'	νβ'	νγ'	νδ'	νε'	νς'	νζ'	νη'	νθ'
50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
ξ'	ξα'	ξβ'	ξγ'	ξδ'	ξε'	ξς'	ξζ'	ξη'	ξθ'
60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
ο'	οα'	οβ'	ογ'	οδ'	οε'	ος'	οζ'	οη'	οθ'
70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
π'	πα'	πβ'	πγ'	πδ'	πε'	πς'	πζ'	πη'	πθ'
80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89
ρ'	ρα'	ρβ'	ργ'	ρδ'	ρε'	ρς'	ρζ'	ρη'	ρθ'
90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99
100.	200.	300.	400.	500.	600.	700.	800.	900.	1000.
ρ'	σ'	τ'	υ'	φ'	χ'	ψ'	ω'	ϑ'	α'.

From the above *Table*, the Reader will perceive how the 24 *Letters* are employed in *unison* with the 3 *Greek Cyphers*, called *επισημον* *Ταυ*, *Κοππα*, and *Σανπι*, to denote Numbers, and that *not one* of the numerous *stenographical CONTRACTIONS* or *LIGATURES* of the *LETTERS* of the *Greek Alphabet* appears throughout the *whole Scale*, (See the *Table of Contractions* in *Greek Grammars*,) and therefore, it is clearly *ungrammatical* to use any of the *Three Greek Cyphers*, or *Episemons*, viz. *ς*. *ζ*. and *ϑ*, as the *numerical representatives* of any one or two *Letters* of the *Greek Alphabet*, in writing the *NAME* of a *MAN*, or even in a *word* of any sort, for to give place to such an idea would be to allow that the *Letters* and *Episemons* are *one and the same thing*, which they are not.





